

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the ^{Classical} Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December. 1936

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3, The University, Glasgow, W. 2

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. FORDYCE. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)
Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.
F. H. SANDRAOE, M.A.
Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. L

FEBRUARY, 1936

No. 1

CONTENTS

	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	I	<i>Fragments der Vorsokratiker</i> (Diels-Kranz), H. C. BALDREY, 19; <i>Plato's Theory of Knowledge</i> (Cornford), G. C. FIELD, 21; <i>Studies in the Platonic Epistles</i> (Morrow), D. TARRANT, 22; <i>Aristotle: Athenian Constitution, Eudemian Ethics</i> (Rackham), J. L. STOCKS, 22; <i>Longinus on Elevation of Style</i> translated (Tucker), J. TATE, 23; <i>Greek Short-hand Manuals</i> (Milne), C. H. ROBERTS, 24; <i>Lucilia</i> (Terzaghi), O. SNOTSCH, 25; <i>D. Iunii Iuvenalis satiras</i> (Vianello), A. E. HOUSMAN, 26; <i>Celsus: De Medicina</i> , vol. I (Spencer), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 27; <i>Latin Verse Inscriptions</i> (Purdie), R. SYME, 27; <i>The Ancient World</i> (Glover), A. F. GILES, 28; <i>European Civilization</i> , i-ii, A. F. GILES, 29; <i>A History of Delos</i> (Laidlaw), H. A. ORMEROD, 30; <i>Aspects of Athenian Democracy</i> (Bonner), D. C. MACGREGOR, 31; <i>Filippo il Macedone</i> (Momigliano), M. HOLROYD, 32; <i>Senate and Provinces, 78-49 B.C.</i> (Cobban), C. G. STONE, 33; <i>The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome</i> (Ashby), A. W. VAN BUREN	34
GREEK FOR 'ATHEISM,' J. TATE	3	SHORT REVIEWS	36
PINDAR, <i>Nem.</i> IX. 32. F. CLAYTON	5	CORRESPONDENCE	43
EUBOEIA AND SAMOS IN THE DELIAN CONFEDERACY. A. W. GOMME	6	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	44
NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT. W. S. MAGUINNNESS	9	BOOKS RECEIVED	47
A PROCIUM IN AESCHYLUS? E. HARRISON .. II			
JOSEPHUS, <i>Ant. Jud.</i> XVIII 6, 5 § 172. J. E. POWELL	11		
Tam magnus AGAIN. W. A. LAIDLAW	11		
REVIEWS:			
<i>Greek Ideals and Modern Life</i> (Livingstone), F. R. EARP, 11; <i>Latin: Its Place and Value in Education</i> (Valentine), J. F. DUFF, 12; <i>Homeric Essays</i> (Shewan), G. MURRAY, 13; <i>Pindari Carmina</i> (Bowra), H. J. ROSE, 14; <i>The Agamemnon and The Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus</i> translated (Tucker), A. M. DALE, 16; <i>Les images dans la poésie d'Eschyle: Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et des écrits hippocratiques</i> (Dumortier), D. L. PAGE, 17; <i>Le Origini della Tragedia</i> (Stumpo), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 18; <i>Musaeus: Hero and Leander</i> (Blakeney), S. GASELEE, 19; <i>Die</i>			

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor T. B. L. Webster, The University, Manchester, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

List of Books to be published, February, 1936

Latin

296. *Sidonius*. POEMS AND LETTERS. Translated by W. B. ANDERSON. Two volumes. Vol. I.

Greek

307. *Aristotle*. MINOR WORKS. Translated by W. S. HERR. Three volumes. Vol. I. On Colours, On Things Heard, On Physiognomies, On Plants, On Marvellous Things Heard, Mechanical Problems, On Indivisible Lines, On Positions and Names of Winds.
- 305, 306. *Plutarch*. MORALIA. Translated by F. C. BABBITT. Fourteen volumes. Vols. IV and V.
311. *Sextus Empiricus*. Translated by R. G. BURY. Three volumes. Vol. III.

Machines or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).

Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

ad
on
al
to
te

al
gs.
gs
cal
on
aid
ual

er,
ent
the
ity,
en,
iz.,
liff,
and
on,

b.

es
ad

I.

On
ags
of

V.

rey

AN
2-
tes
On
wa
W
Th
cu
di
bo
pr
of
co
wa
tic
pa
cla
R
pr
an
Pr
bo
H
lo
ap
pr
de
me
fun
Gr
on
 μ
in
on
E
pa
bo
wi
an
th
Po
be
ref
th
sol
ex
R.
wh
an

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1936

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Classical Association held its Annual General Meeting on January 2-4 at Westminster School by courtesy of the Headmaster and Governors. On the first evening the Association was received at Skinners' Hall by the Worshipful Master of the Company. The proceedings opened with a discussion in which teachers spoke of the difficulty of obtaining suitable textbooks, particularly in Greek; and representatives of the University presses of Oxford and Cambridge stated the commercial aspect of the position: it was resolved to ask for closer co-operation between examining bodies. The papers ranged over the whole field of classical studies. The President, the Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery, discussed the prehistory, geography, construction and character-drawing of the *Odyssey*. Professor E. S. Forster considered the botany of Homer and decided that Homer was a gardener, rather than a lover of wild nature, and that he always approached trees and plants from the practical standpoint. Mr. J. A. Davison deduced from Pindar's odes and fragments his view of poetry, its nature and functions, contrasting the views of earlier Greek poets: he laid particular stress on Pindar's use of the words σοφία and μούσα. Mr. J. E. Powell spoke of the influence of the war and later events on Thucydidean studies in Germany, England, France and Italy; he compared the work of Schwartz and others both with that of earlier scholars and with that of later scholars such as Jaeger and Weinstock. Mr. R. P. Hinks traced the history of Greek painting from Polygnotus to Apelles so far as it can be reconstructed with the aid of literary references and vases. He maintained that then for the first time painters had solved the problem of representing the external world as it appears. Miss J. R. Bacon noticed the various periods at which Plautus's plays were popular from ancient times to the present day; she

brought evidence to show that Shakespeare was acquainted with Plautus in Latin texts. Professor E. F. Jacob ended the chronological sequence by a masterly analysis of the styles of mediaeval Latin and a description of the method of teaching it. At the Business Meeting Professor R. M. Henry was elected President.

The Classical Association of Scotland held its winter meeting at St. Andrews on November 2. Mr. H. M. Bell opened with a paper on 'Satire,' and the President, Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson, delivered his address on 'The Stars in the Classics.' The annual dinner took place on the previous evening, the President being the chief guest.

The Frogs of Aristophanes will be produced in Cambridge at the new Arts Theatre (near the Market Place) from Tuesday, March 3rd, to Saturday, March 7th, at 8.30 p.m.; there will also be matinées on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, at 2.15. The special arrangements for parties from Schools and Universities attending the matinées are being circulated in the usual way.

The play will be produced by Mr J. T. Sheppard, Provost of King's, and Mr G. H. W. Rylands; and the new music, specially composed by Mr Walter Leigh, will be under the direction of Mr Bernhard Ord. A box, for five, will cost two guineas (on the Saturday night, £2 10. 0); other seats from 7s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. (on the Saturday night, from 10s. 6d. to 2s. 6d.).

An International Numismatic Congress will be held in London from June 30 to July 3 in conjunction with the celebration of the Centenary of the Royal Numismatic Society of London. The sections will be (I) Greek, (II) Roman, (III) Medieval and Modern, (IV) British and Colonial, (V) Oriental, (VI) Medals, medallions, etc. The Pro-

ceedings of the Congress will be published in a special number of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, which will be issued to each member of the Congress. Applications for membership, with the fee of a guinea, should be sent to the Congress Secretary, c/o Royal Numismatic Society, 22 Russell Square, London, W.C. 1.

When the Athenians prefaced a date in the last third of the month with the word *φθίνοντος* they reckoned the day, as is well known, by counting backwards from the last day of the month. In the fourth century they commonly appended to the date the words *μετ' εικάδας*; and though one or two scholars supposed them so far the slaves of habit that they continued to reckon the day backwards, they have generally been believed to follow the dictates of reason and count forward from the 20th. Professor Meritt, publishing in the fourth volume of *Hesperia* three inscriptions from the Agora, has now settled this question. It appears that they commonly reckoned backwards, but sometimes forwards; thus *τρίτη μετ' εικάδας* will commonly mean the 28th, or, if the month is *κοῖλος*, the 27th, but may also mean the 23rd. The effect of Professor Meritt's demonstration upon accepted views of the Attic calendar must be studied in *Hesperia* by specialists. The practical advantages of a system by which a date may, in any one month, indicate two different days hardly need pointing out, but one may regret that the system was not introduced in time for *Strepsiades* to make use of it.

Ὁ ἐξεταστικός βίος οὐ βιωτὸς ἀνθρώπῳ.

It will be no news to our readers in this country that certain examinations with which many of them are concerned have themselves undergone a searching examination ('And these have *larger* still to bite 'em'). Details of *An Examination of Examinations*, the first fruit of the International Institute Examinations Enquiry, are given on a later page (47). Since that pamphlet has small Latin and no Greek, and a volume of

essays is to follow, let us await in trembling hope the book.

From a correspondent:

'The strictures on bad transliteration which you recently published (*C.R.* XLIX. 165) have prompted me to a plea for more Greek in Greek names. Greece was so long seen through Latin spectacles that uniformity cannot now be attained and is not to be desired. "Aegina" and "Euboea" must persist, I dare say, and perhaps "Ajax" should survive beside "Aias": but Odysseus now usually gets his Greek name in un-Latin contexts, and "Ulysses" in a book about Homer would jar. Let us go further. "Dionysus", for instance, was venial when scholars wrote in Latin and no Latin name for the god would serve; but that name scarcely found its way into classical Latin, and we can easily substitute "-os" in an unstressed syllable, without offence to eye or ear. An awful warning of the dangers of bad transliteration is supplied by the nouns in *-εως*. *Βριαρεύς* indeed is found in Callimachus (by the way, the new edition of Liddell and Scott ignores the form), and Latin poets have *Briareus* scanned as an anapaest: but *Τυνδάρεως* is rare and dubious outside Homer, and I find no evidence for *Τυνδαρεύς*, or for *Tyndareus* apart from Lewis and Short's assertion "trisyl." Yet in our classrooms "Tyndareus" prevails, pronounced so as to rhyme with "deuce". Some fine day we shall have "Mene-laüs" rhyming with "Santa Claus".

The editors have received two queries, to the first of which they append an answer. They take this opportunity to say that they will always try to find room for questions, of interest to classical scholarship, the answers to which are not within easy reach.

I. 'Not having access to old editions or to facsimiles, I wonder why some modern texts of the *Prometheus*, Wilamowitz's among them, give as line 52, without note,

οὐκ οὐν ἐπείξει δεσμὰ τῷδε περιβαλεῖν,

while others have τῷδε δεσμὰ, likewise without note'.

The editors have been helped by a

in
to
to
ap
le
ea
th
og
th
pe
a
ha
hi
th
(of
po
un

ph
wh
οὐ
exi
the
difi
θεο

1
see
pp.
2
cf. 1

of th
in Δ
elsev

24bc

friend to reply. The order $\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\delta\epsilon$ appears in the Aldine *editio princeps* of 1518, and the other seems not to have been adopted by any editor of the play until the nineteenth century was far advanced. Bothe in 1831 stated that the variant $\tau\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}$ was published from a Paris MS in 1787; but the first to record $\tau\eta\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}$ appears to have been Samuel Butler, in 1809; he had found it in two Cambridge MSS, but rejected it because of the juxtaposition $-\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon-$. Wellauer in 1823 quoted $\tau.\delta.$ from two Vienna MSS also, and by 1841 at latest scholars could learn from Dindorf that $\tau.\delta.$ is the reading of the

Medicean MS. A recent text which gives the evidence, though concisely, is Weir Smyth's, in the Loeb edition of 1922: ' $\tau.\delta.$ M, $\delta.\tau.$ rec.' Editors who follow M as a rule, but print $\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\delta\epsilon$ without warning, have played false. Apart from M's authority, which order is to be preferred? Hermann as well as Butler voted for $\delta.\tau.$: but the sober verdict of scholars might hesitate.

II. 'Whereas $\epsilon\pi\iota$ and $\alpha\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$, and finite verbs in $-\iota$, are subject to elision, why are $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$, and datives in $-\iota$, almost immune? Having groped a while for an explanation, I now appeal to my betters.'

GREEK FOR 'ATHEISM.'

IF Socrates was accused of disbelieving in the gods of the state, it is easy to understand how his critical attitude towards the poetic mythologies encouraged¹ the prejudice against him² which led to his trial and death. For it might easily appear to the stupid or malevolent that his disbelief in (say) Hesiod's *Theogony* involved disbelief in the gods therein described. He was clearly suspected of such an atheistic tendency for a further reason: his 'old accusers' had, from ignorance or malice, classed him also (*Apol.* 18c, 23d, 26d) among the materialistic investigators of nature (of the Anaxagorean type), who were popularly charged, and not altogether unjustly, with atheism.³

These considerations suggest that the phrase in the indictment of Socrates which runs $\text{o}\delta\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \eta\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\omega\iota\varsigma$ means 'not believing in the existence of the gods in whose existence the city believes'; i.e. that there is no difference in meaning between $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$.⁴

¹ As is suggested in Plato, *Euthyphro* 6a—see further my articles in *C.Q.* XXVII, 1933, pp. 74, 159.

² As a dangerous Sophist, *Apol.* 23d 6-7, cf. 19c.

³ *Laws* XII 967; the Anaxagorean lineage of the fourth-century atheists attacked by Plato in *Laws* X is also clear, as I hope to show elsewhere.

⁴ Such is my interpretation of Plato *Apol.* 24bc, D.L. II 40.

But according to Burnet⁵ such a difference in meaning exists: $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ means "'to worship the gods,'" "'to acknowledge'" them 'by giving them the worship prescribed by νόμος, "use and wont,"' whereas $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ means 'to believe in' their 'existence.' Hence this portion of the indictment was (he said) a charge 'of nonconformity in religious practice, not of unorthodoxy in religious belief.'

Professor A. E. Taylor writes to the same effect: according to *Varia Socratica* p. 7, the accusation was not 'one of unbelief,' nor do its words 'even imply that Socrates had ever called in question the existence of "the gods whom the city recognizes." For $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ does not mean merely to believe that there are gods, but to "recognize" the gods by paying them the honour due to them. . . . A man who $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ may be very far from atheism.' He is apparently still of this mind, for in his welcome translation (1934) of the *Laws* (p. li) he denies that Socrates was accused of 'holding heretical opinions.'

It seems obvious to me that the Burnet-Taylor view (together with the consequences drawn from it) is adequately refuted by the text of Plato's *Apology* (e.g. 26bc, 27bcd). For a plain statement of the refutation see R. Hackforth,

⁵ On *Euthyphro* 3b 3, *Apol.* 24c 1, 26c 2; cf. *G.P.* p. 180.

The Composition of Plato's Apology pp. 60 ff., where it is demonstrated that *θεὸς νομίζειν* in the indictment not only can, but does in fact, mean 'to believe in the existence of the gods.'

The purpose of the present article is to reinforce this refutation by calling attention to the use of this phrase in Plato, *Laws* X.

It is universally admitted that the first heresy which Plato demolishes in *Laws* X is 'atheism, the belief that there are no gods at all.'¹ Plato's task is first of all διδάσκειν ὡς εἰσὶ θεοί (885d 2, cf. 888a 2, 905d 2, 907b 5 etc.)—not, be it noted, to persuade non-practising believers (or unbelievers) to practise religion, but to persuade unbelievers that gods exist. To express 'disbelief in (the existence of) gods' he uses various phrases. I am here concerned with the four passages in which he says of the atheists οὐ νομίζουσι θεοὺς or the like. In these four places εἶναι is omitted; and yet, in spite of Burnet and Taylor, νομίζειν plainly does not mean 'to worship' but 'to believe in' (the existence of):—

(1) 885c 7. In 885b the impious are divided into three classes, of which the first does not believe in the existence of gods; b 4, 7: οὐχ ἡγούμενος θεοὺς εἶναι. In 885c 6, 7 the impious are supposed to retort: 'Yes, you are right, certain among us do not believe in the existence of gods at all': θεοὺς οὐδαμῶς νομίζομεν. (Note the omission of εἶναι.) The accusation is thus admitted, and repeated in slightly different terms. The expressions οὐχ ἡγούμενος θεοὺς εἶναι and θεοὺς οὐδαμῶς νομίζομεν describe the same state of disbelief. The omission of εἶναι makes no difference; νομίζομεν cannot possibly mean 'worship'; for the impious were accused, not of refusing worship, but of refusing belief.²

Taylor here translates ἡγούμενος εἶναι 'believes in' and νομίζομεν 'recognize.' If by 'recognize' he means 'recognize the existence of,' he is, of course, per-

fectly correct. But it is to be feared that he means (as he explained in *Var. Soc.* quoted above) 'recognize the gods by paying them the honour due to them,' the refusal of which honour 'may be very far from atheism.' It would appear that owing to the absence of εἶναι Taylor in spite of the context insists that νομίζομεν means 'worship.'

(2) 899c 2. The argument on the first kind of impiety is directed against τῷ . . . μὴ νομίζοντι θεοὺς. This phrase means 'the disbeliever in the existence of gods,' for (as I have shown above) the argument is in fact intended to establish their existence.

Taylor's translation reads 'him who has hitherto declined to acknowledge gods.' If he means 'acknowledge their existence' he is correct. But one must regretfully note that in all probability he has adopted the word from Burnet's interpretation of νομίζειν above quoted: 'to acknowledge by giving them the worship prescribed.' The omission of εἶναι makes no difference to Taylor's interpretation of ἡγείσθαι θεοὺς in 899c 9, d 1, 7 ('believe in'), as compared with his translation of ἡγείσθαι θεοὺς εἶναι in d 5 ('confess being of'). Why should the omission matter so much for the sense of νομίζειν?

But though, even in this context which fairly bristles with pointers to the true meaning, Taylor apparently sticks to his guns, one may detect a slight wavering at 899d 8, where νομίζειν εἶναι is translated 'acknowledgment,' i.e. (on the view of Burnet, Taylor and everyone else) 'acknowledgment of their existence' (not 'acknowledgment' in the alleged sense of 'worship,' for εἶναι is here present). Does this mean that Taylor would like us to take the 'acknowledgment' of his translation of 899c 2 in the sense 'acknowledge their existence'? We remember Burnet's equation (νομίζειν=acknowledge=worship), and will not be so obliging.

(3) 908c 4. In stating the penalties for the first kind of heresy Plato defines it more than once. It is τὸ μὴ νομίζειν θεοὺς (without εἶναι). It is 'the opinion that all things are empty of gods' (c 2: τῇ δόξῃ τῇ θεῶν ἔρημα εἶναι πάντα, cf. b 4: μὴ νομίζοντι θεοὺς εἶναι). Can there be stronger proof that τὸ μὴ νομί-

¹ So Taylor, *Plato* p. 490, *Laws* tr. p. lii.

² Further, for Plato to reproach the atheists with not *worshipping* would be inconsistent with 908-9: the honest atheist who refuses worship is far less dangerous, and is far more leniently treated, than the hypocrite who hides his disbelief.

ἐν τῇ
κρί-
ἀνδρ-
κλέ-
ἀ φέρ-
ἔπ-
ἐκρυ-
οὐνε-
θυμ-
δὲ

F
all th
pass

ζειν θεούς and τὸ μὴ νομίζειν θεοὺς εἶναι mean precisely the same thing, namely, atheism, disbelief in the existence of gods? But there is no need to labour the point, for Taylor, in his exposition quoted above, himself declares that the first kind of heresy, here listed, is 'atheism, the belief that there are no gods at all.'

What will his translation make of the absence of εἶναι this time? With pardonable excitement one turns up his rendering of τὸ μὴ νομίζειν θεοὺς. Will it be—in defiance of *Varia Socratica* (and Burnet)—'disbelief in the existence of gods,' or—in defiance of *Plato: The Man and His Work*—'refusal to worship gods'? The dilemma is plain, and there is no escape. Happily it is the earlier work that is sacrificed: according to Taylor's translation of the *Laws* p. 302, l. 17, τὸ μὴ νομίζειν θεοὺς is, in spite of the absence of εἶναι, sound Greek for 'atheism.'

(4) 909b 1: τῷ θεοῦ μὴ νομίζειν is similar to (3). (And let no one retort that εἶναι is 'understood' from the end of the line; for this is precisely the point, that εἶναι is 'understood.') Here again Taylor translates 'atheism.'

There are other points on which I hope elsewhere to appeal from Taylor expositor to Taylor translator. Meanwhile may we invite him in the name of consistency to revise his theories of Socrates' 'impiety' as set forth in *Var. Soc. c. I* and elsewhere?

I now give the statistics for what they are worth. As in the *Apology*, there are in *Laws* X four completely interchangeable expressions, meaning

'to believe in the existence of' (used with θεοὺς on each occasion in this book):—

(a) νομίζειν θεοὺς, four times as noted above;

(b) νομίζειν θεοὺς εἶναι, twice (899d 8, 908b 4);

(c) ἡγείσθαι θεοὺς, four times (899c 9, d 1, d 7, 900b 7);

(d) ἡγείσθαι θεοὺς εἶναι, twice (885b 4, 899d 5).

The *Apology* exhibits much the same proportion of insertions to omissions of εἶναι. When, therefore, we translate 'atheism' into Greek prose, using νομίζειν (or ἡγείσθαι), we may omit εἶναι with a clear conscience.

We may well agree with Burnet (*G.P.* p. 302) and Taylor (introd. to *Laws*) that the *Laws* has been too 'little appreciated' and 'known.' According to *Apol.* 18c 3 and 23d 6 it is popularly said of those who study (as Socrates was supposed to do) astronomy, sophistry, etc., that they do not νομίζειν θεοὺς, and Anaxagoras was quoted (26d) in support of the popular censure. If Burnet had remembered *Laws* XII 967 he would never have contended that νομίζειν in these passages means 'worship.' For the aged Plato tells us there what the general complaint against thinkers of the Anaxagorean (967b 5, c 4) stamp really was: it was supposed (he says) that such studies made men ἄθεοι (a 3; cf. ἀθεότηας in c 6), and, as the context clearly shows, ἄθεοι (like ἄθεος in *Apol.* 26c 3) means 'denying the existence of the gods,' 'atheists.'

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

PINDAR, NEM. IX. 32.

ἐντὶ τοι φίλοιπτοί τ' αὐτόθι καὶ κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες
κρέσσονας
ἄνδρες. ἀπιστον εἶπ'· αἰδῶς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει
κλέπτεται,
ἃ φέρεי δόξαν. Χρομίω κεν ὑπασπίζων, παρὰ περὶ θόβαις
ἵπποις τε ναῶν τ' ἐν μάχαις,
ἔκρινας, ἂν κίνδυνον ὕψις αὐτῶν.
οὐνεκεν ἐν πολέμῳ κείνα θεὸς ἔντυεν αὐτοῦ
θυμὸν αἰχματᾶν ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν Ἐνναλίου. παῖροι
δὲ . . .

FARNELL'S note appears to contain all the views hitherto advanced on this passage. It is as follows:

'Different interpretations can be given to this passage according as we take ἄν as particle or as syncopated form of ἀνά and οὐνεκεν as = ὅτι after ἔκρινας, or as = ἐπεὶ. (a) "Wert thou squire to Chromios, thou wouldst have been able to judge his quality (Χρομίω repeated from Χρομίῳ) in the hour of danger, since, etc."; but to supply the accusative after ἔκρινας from the preceding dative is a harshness to be avoided if possible.

(b) "Wert thou squire to Chromios, thou wouldst have been able to judge, in the hour of danger . . . that, etc.": this use of *οὐνεκεν* is found in Homer, but not elsewhere in Pindar. But the defect in both these renderings is that *ἀνὰ κίνδυνον* . . . *αὐτὰς* coming between l. 34 and ll. 36-37 is somewhat weak and redundant. (c) "If thou hadst been squire to Chromios . . . thou wouldst have been able to form some judgment of the peril of the keen battle-shout, for that honour, etc."; this is far stronger, because ironical: "you would know what fighting meant." The only drawback is the redundancy of the particles *κεν* and *αὐ*; he might have noted that they were sometimes used together in Homer as ll. xi. 187, Od. v. 361.¹ To some readers the curious sense will also appear a drawback.

In fact, there are objections to all these interpretations, but above all the common objection that in none does

the sense run smoothly on. In (b) it is interrupted by *ἀν κίνδυνον κτλ.* and in the other two *κεῖνα θεός* makes a startling appearance after *αἰδώς* has been forgotten. One would expect *αἰδώς* to be implied in the object of *ἐκρίνας*, and, if *ἐκρίνας* is taken absolutely, with the punctuation given above, that is what happens. *Χρομίῳ* is in the emphatic position, and this helps.

'In Aetna you have lovers of horsemanship and men with souls above mere property. Incredible, eh? Because under the surface Honour is usurped by self-interest, your Honour that gives men reputation. Well, in Chromius' case, had you been his squire amid footmen or horses or in conflict of ships, you had judged of *that*, in peril of screaming onset; for on the battle-field that self-same Honour accoutred his warrior-soul, to repel the onslaught of the war-god. True, there are few . . .'

F. CLAYTON.

King's College, Cambridge.

EUBOEAE AND SAMOS IN THE DELIAN CONFEDERACY.

PROFESSOR KAHRSTEDT in a recent article (*Nachr. Ges. Göttingen*, 1931, pp. 159 ff.; see also his *Staatsgebiet u. Staatsangehörige in Athen*, 1934, pp. 32 ff.) has argued that in 446 all the land of Chalcis, Eretria and some other places in Euboea, as well as that of Hestiaea, and in 439 all that of Samos, was confiscated by Athens and declared Athenian state-land; and that, though there was a different procedure in practice, in that in Hestiaea only a small number of the original inhabitants were allowed to remain (the Ellopioi of *I.G.* i² 40-1), whereas in Chalcis, Eretria and Samos, as in Lesbos, all or most remained, there was no difference in law; that the original inhabitants became in law foreigners with permission, that could at any time be revoked, to stay on Athenian territory—as *metoikoi*, but with a much more precarious tenure than the *metics* at Athens; they got only 'einen prekären Besitz', and Athens had the right to dispossess them, and undertook 'ganz freiwillig und nicht in Vertragsform' (p. 164) to make use of this right only in certain circumstances.

(A) *Euboea*. There was a cleruchy

sent to Chalcis (*Plut. Per.* 23), a colony to Eretria (possibly: *I.G.* i² 396; cf. 39 42), *τεμένη* of Athena Polias (?) at Hestiaea and Orobiae (on the west coast, near the north-west end of the channel, and so not far from Hestiaea) (*I.G.* i² 376): all these indicate confiscated land. Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 715) and later writers (*Isocr.* iv 108; *Aeschin.* ii 175; *Diod.* xi 88. 3; *Paus.* i 27. 5) speak of Euboea as Athenian in the fifth century; and Andocides iii 9 says that two-thirds of the island was Athenian.¹ By separat-

¹ Actually: Aristophanes says that the demagogues were always promising to give Euboea to the people and never doing it; Isocrates that the generous Athenians did not take the land in Euboea, as they took that of Scione, though they had the power; the passage in Aeschines is that which is taken, almost word for word, from this passage of Andocides, and has no independent value; and Diodorus and Pausanias both say only that Tolmides, among his other exploits, led cleruchs to Euboea—if this is true, it cannot refer to the settlement of 446 B.C., for Tolmides was killed at Coronea (his cleruchy may have been one of the causes of the revolt of Euboea: see Busolt, iii 415-6). Andocides iii 3-9 contains, as is well known, 'mehrere grobe Irrtümer' (Busolt, iii p. 317), all repeated by Aeschines.

ing Carystus, Styra, and a few insignificant communities, whose names appear in the tribute-lists and who were therefore *ξύμμαχοι*, from the number of those whose land was confiscated, Kahrstedt finds that these account for about one-third of the area of the island; and Andocides is abundantly justified in calling the rest Athenian—for all, Chalcidians, Eretrians, as well as Hestiaeans, were dispossessed. *I.G.* i² 39 (the Chalcis decree: Tod, no. 42) and 40-41 (the Hestiaeans decrees) make this abundantly clear.

The evidence against this view would seem to be as strong as the evidence for it is weak. (1) Thucydides i 114. 3, *τὴν μὲν ἄλλην ὁμολογία κατεστήσαντο, Ἐστιαῖας δὲ ἐξοικίσαντες αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον*, makes a perfectly clear distinction between the treatment of Hestiaeans and the other cities. (2) Chalcis and Eretria continued to pay tribute (as *ξύμμαχοι* therefore) after 446 as they had done before, as Carystus and Styra and the rest did, and as Hestiaeans did not (see *S.E.G.* v, *Index*); just as in his list of those fighting in Sicily (vii 57. 4) Thucydides groups together Eretria, Chalcis, Styra and Carystus (as well as Ceos, Andros and others) as *ὑπήκοοι καὶ φόρου ὑποτελεῖς*. Why then does Kahrstedt draw his line between Hestiaeans, Chalcis and Eretria on the one hand, and the remaining third of the island on the other, instead of between Hestiaeans and the rest? Only in order to give plausibility to Andocides. Andros and Naxos, and other states to which cleruchies were sent, also continued to pay tribute and to count as subject allies; because, as everybody but Kahrstedt has recognized, only a small portion of their land was taken for Athenian settlers, and the *πόλις* remained in being. So we may believe Plutarch that a cleruchy was sent to Chalcis, and *I.G.* i² 396 may be restored *τῆς ἀποικίας τῆς ἐς Ἐρ[έτριαν]*, without being involved in Kahrstedt's views. The four cities of Lesbos, all of whose land was taken in 427, paid no tribute, as Thucydides takes care to explain.¹

(3) *I.G.* i² 39. Kahrstedt admits

¹ Kahrstedt will not allow that there were any Athenian settlers in Mytilene: the cleruchs drew their rents in Athens; principally because

(p. 165-6) that the Chalcidians formed a *κοινόν*, that they elected their own magistrates, that they could tax themselves, that they could send delegates to Athens to discuss the amount of the tribute. We can go further: they formed a *πόλις* (l. 6), and, with the one modification that cases involving exile or death or disfranchisement might or must be referred to Athens (see below), *τὰς εὐθύνας Χαλκιδεῦσι κατὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι ἐν Χαλκίδι καθάπερ Ἀθηναίων* (ll. 71-3). That is precisely the *αὐτονομία*, on one condition (loyalty to Athens) and with one reservation (the reference of certain lawsuits to Athens), enjoyed by all or most of the other members of the league who were *φόρου ὑποτελεῖς*.² Yet Kahrstedt thinks that the oath taken by the Athenians shows 'dass der einzelne Chalkidier der athenischen Justiz unmittelbar untersteht; für bestimmte Kriminalurteile besteht ein Appellrecht an das athenische Gericht. Das ist kein Bundesrecht'; and that their rights to occupation of the land were only 'precariously guaranteed'. Consider the circumstances and the wording of the oath. Athens has just driven out all the inhabitants of Hestiaeans, and put new settlers on their land, to punish an alleged atrocity; she now, in the most solemn form, swears that nothing of that kind shall happen in Chalcis: 'I will not drive out the Chalcidians nor destroy the city nor disfranchise nor exile nor punish with death or fine any man of Chalcis without trial, without a decree of the Athenian people; and I will not put to the vote any proposal for any illegal trial'. The *boule* and the *dicasts*, each representing Athens as a whole, must take the oath; and representatives of Chalcis are to administer it. What could be clearer? Hestiaeans had been driven out, by one single vote

Athens could not afford to lose any man of military age (*Staatsgebiet*, p. 38). On the contrary, Athens would be glad to convert many thetes into hoplites, and have a garrison in Lesbos. This was worth more to them at the time than the tribute. See Tod's comments (*Greek Hist. Inscr.*, p. 136).

² Kahrstedt rejects Davis' restoration of *I.G.* i² 60 (*A.J.A.* 1926, 177-9); but at least the grant of autonomy to Mytilene, at the same time as the regulations of the settlers' rights, seems to be certain.

of the ecclesia; the Chalcidians are guaranteed against that, as in their possession of their land. And the precarious guarantee, 'nicht in Vertragsform'? How could an undertaking be given more solemnly than by this mutual oath?

In fact, not only is it not true that 'es gibt also in allen athenischen Kolonien nur ein Bodenrecht: der ganze Boden gehört Athen, politisch und als zivilrechtlichem Eigentümer' (*Staatsgebiet*, p. 39); but the original inhabitants, when they were allowed to remain, were but μέτοικοι with a precarious right of ἐγκτησις ('nur Bittbesitz'); but the opposite is the case where, as in Chalcis, Eretria, Naxos, Andros and other states, only a portion of the land was settled by cleruchs. Though in practice the privileged position of these cleruchs was a strong one, for in case of need they would serve as a garrison, in law it was they who were, in relation to the πόλις of the original inhabitants, μέτοικοι: they had ἐγκτησις, but they had no part in the public life of the πόλις, whose citizens conducted their affairs independently, 'as the Athenians in Athens'.

A word about the εὐθυναί. Tod (p. 85) says it 'refers to the punishment of any Chalcidian citizen and not to the official examination of magistrates at the expiry of their office'; and Kahrstedt seems to agree. But in a decree moved and carried in the Athenian ecclesia, the word should have its usual Attic meaning; and why should Athens bother herself about, say, a homicide case in Chalcis of a purely private character? What Athens was concerned with was the possibility of disloyalty, in all its forms, on the part of the magistrates of an allied city; that is the crime, defined as treason, which might be punished by exile, death or disfranchisement. (What meaning, by the way, does Kahrstedt give to ἀτιμία applied to his Chalcidians?) All such cases shall be referred to the Athenian courts; not, in such cases appeal to Athens is allowed; again giving the proper meaning to the word ἔφεσις.¹

¹ Antiphon, v 47, does not contradict this view.

(B) Samos. By the settlement of 439 Samos henceforth was to have no fleet and also to pay no tribute (only reparations for the cost of the war): 'darin nähert sich Samos dem Typ eines restlos kleruchisierten Landes, einer athenischen Kolonie an', just like Mytilene; even though Thucydides (i 117. 3) says nothing about a cleruchy. Further there were τεμένη on the island of the ἐπώνυμοι Ἀθήνηθεν (and this in the Attic alphabet), of Ἀθηναία Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα,² and of Ἴων Ἀθήνηθεν—quite sufficient to show 'dass wir uns auf Samos auf athenischem Gebiet befinden'. Moreover, when Thucydides (viii 21) says that Athens restored to the island its αὐτονομία, he must, according to Kahrstedt, be using this word in its technical legal meaning, and in this sense all the φόρου ὑποτελεῖς were autonomous; therefore, in order to have its autonomy restored, Samos must have been in an inferior position to the majority of the subject states, that is, was an Athenian colony. That is all the evidence Kahrstedt can bring; yet he himself refers to many passages in Thucydides where the distinction is made between the ξύμμαχοι αὐτόνομοι and the φόρου ὑποτελεῖς (including vii 57. 4, quoted above); and that αὐτονομία was a word with a wide range of meaning, even on official documents, should be familiar to everyone. An island-state that had had its walls destroyed and been forbidden to have a fleet might well be said to lose its autonomy without necessarily having had all its land confiscated as well. But we can go further than this. Kahrstedt admits that it is surprising that 'die Selbstverwaltungsgemeinde der Eingeborenen . . . bis 412 plutokratischen Charakter hatte' (Thuc. viii 21), though not more so than if Samos had been an ordinary subject-ally. There is, however, something much more surprising

² The lettering of one of these is, according to Schede (*Ath. Mitt.* xlv. 2-3), more like that of the first half of the fifth century, some time before 439; the other Schede would put in 411-04, the period of full autonomy. These points Kahrstedt does not discuss. A similar inscription from Carpathos, which he cites, is now dated by Dinsmoor in 394-3 or 377-6 B.C. (*A.J.A.* 1932, 155-160).

than that to be read in Thucydides: not only did oligarchs hold power, but they held the land; and after the successful revolution the democrats, in the presence of some Athenian forces, divided it out among themselves (*αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν καὶ οἰκίας νεμέμενοι*), with the happy result, according to Kahrstedt, that the grateful Athenians, having seen their own property seized, granted them autonomy.¹ 'Fighting for the crown?' asked Alice. 'Yes, to be sure', said the King: 'and the best of the joke is, that it's my crown all the while.'

¹ Samos was in fact treated in 439 in a much more generous spirit than other allies who had revolted (unless the reparations were excessively heavy), for she paid no tribute (Meritt and West, *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.*, p. 69), and later an oligarchic government was allowed. It is wrong to think of Athenian policy towards the cities as having been all of a piece, and her organization of the empire as everywhere systematic. The treatment of Mytilene too, to judge from *I.G.* i² 60, was milder than one would have guessed from Thucydides alone.

A last point. 'War Samos athenisches Gebiet, gewinnt das Relief *J.H.S.* iv 1883-4, 335 ff., Sinn und Farbe. Es stellt die athenischen Maasse öffentlich aus, führt sie also sicher als obligatorisch ein—ganz in der Ordnung, wenn Samos athenisch wird. Seine Datierung in das Jahr 439 ist nun mehr doppelt sicher'. This is the metrological relief in Oxford representing the head, shoulders and breast of a man, with outstretched arms, and in the field the sole of a foot. But the foot (0.296 m. long) represents a different scale of measurement from the rest of the figure, and it is not the Attic foot; it has now been known for some time that this was 0.328 m.—the shorter (Roman) foot was only introduced into Attica in Roman times. And the provenance of this relief is quite uncertain: it may have come from Samos, that is all. Colour perhaps, but not sense.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT.

THE example of Professor Dunbabin in *C.R.* XLVIII and XLIX has encouraged me to put together the following notes. They are a few selected examples of the misdirection to which students who rely uncritically on Lewis and Short are liable.

AMBAGO, COMMEDITOR, EXERCIO (*Q. Cic. Pet. Cons.* II 45): the asterisks are mistaken.

ARELAS: the line of Ausonius cited shows *Arelatē*. For that neuter, as for the feminine *Arelas* and for other forms, see *Thes.*

AUGURIOR: not in *L.S.*, but established in *Thes.* ii, col. 1376. To the examples there quoted add *Pan. Lat.* (W. Baehrens) 4 2 2. The existence of this word somewhat supports *inauguriarint*, read by the better MSS. in *Pan.* 10 2 5. *Inaugurio* is not in *L.S.* or *Forcell.* See W. Baehrens, *Pan. Lat. ed. nov. praef. maior*, p. 78.

CAELO: *Quint.* 10 3 18 and *Hor. Ep.* 2 2 92, quoted in sections I and II B

respectively, should go together as examples of *caelo* used in reference to literature.

CALPE: some mention should be made of the 3rd declens. forms found in *Mela* 2 95, *Sid. Ap. Ep.* 8 12 2, and other late authors. This (as Bentley suggested, on *Lucan* 1 555, quoting *Κάλπις* in *Philostr. Vita Ap. Tyan.* 5 1) is the explanation of *Calpē* (abl.) in *Juv.* 14 279, which amazed *Priscian* (7 8), and which *L.S.* do not attempt to explain.

CAUDEUS: not 'wooden,' but roughly 'iunceus.' See *Thes.*

CHELIDON: this word, only quoted in *L.S.* as a proper name, means 'a swallow' in *Pervig. Ven.* 90, and in *Vespa's Iudicium* 55. For another sense see *Housman* on *Juv.* 6 0 6, where also the meaning of *colocyntha* (κολοκύνθη), not in *L.S.*, is discussed. See also *A. f. l. L.* 11 419.

CICCUS: *Thes.* gives *ciccum*, following *Festus* and the *Glossaria*, while *ciccus* rests on *Hesychius' κικκός = διαχώρησις*. While it is probable that the

- accusative, found in such phrases as *ciccum non interdum*, and in Varro's remark in *L.L.* 7 91, was the only form known to Festus and the compilers of the *Glossaria*, and not impossible that the nominative was by their time forgotten, it is safer to assume *ciccum* as the nominative.
- CITER, IIIB: *ultrouque citroque* occurs in *Lucr.* 4 32.
- CONOR: delete (γ). Though the true text of Nepos is quoted, this section assumes the false.
- CUUSCEMODI: quoted once only, for Apuleius, in whose work it is by no means infrequent. See *A. f. l. L.* 10 386, and Neue-Wag. 2⁸ 453, where instances are quoted from Apul. and later authors. Two instances apparently unknown to grammarians and lexicographers are *Pan.* 2 9 4 and 3 8 4.
- DECENNALIS, II: *decennalia* should be described as a festival recurring on every tenth anniversary of an emperor's accession: see *Pan.* 11 1 3. Similarly *quinquennalia*: see *Pan.* 4 2 3. *Vicennalia* is correctly defined, but to the examples given add *Pan.* 4 2 2.
- GERMINO: not 'post-Aug.': see *Hor. Epod.* 16 45.
- HEBRUS: read *Hēbrus*. The first syllable is commonly scanned long.
- INCENTIVUS, IIB: to the examples of subst. *incentivum* add *Pan.* 12 1 4, an interesting example because it seems to connect *incentivum* with the original musical sense of *incentivus*. It disproves the assertion of de Jonge (*Spr. und hist. Komm. zu Amm. Marc.*, 1935, p. 56) that late authors forgot the origin of the word, and associated it with *incendo*.
- INDOLES: this word means 'offspring' (*suboles*) in Seneca, Val. Max., and later authors. See Georges s.v., and to his examples add *Sen. Thyest.* 492, *Pan.* 9 5 3, *Salvianus Ep.* 4 16, 4 24 (plural), and probably 8 2 (plural).
- INTERTRASQUE: 'midway between.'
- There is no sign in L.S. of this adverb, now read in *Lucr.* 2 518, 3 306, 5 472, 5 476, etc. See Munro or Giussani on *Lucr.* 2 518.
2. IUGIS: add *Hor. Ep.* 1 15 16 and *Sat.* 2 6 2.
- NIHIL, I (ρ): *nihildum*, quoted only for Cicero's *Letters*, occurs in *Cat.* 3 3 6; also in *Livy* (see Forcell.).
- PAVIO: add *Sen. Ep.* 90 20, where the word occurs in a not quite correct quotation of *Ov. Met.* 6 55 ff. In the latter passage Ovid probably wrote *paviunt*, not *feriunt*, in l. 58. See Korn's *app. crit.*
- RELIGIO, IIA b: to the instances of *religio* in the sense of 'sacrilege' add *Cic. Att.* 1 14 1, 'Clodiana religione.'
- SCATEBRA: this word, described as 'not ante-Aug.', occurs in Accius' *Oenomaus*, quoted in *Non.* 73 22 ff. The passage also contains an example of *fluvia*, which L.S. attribute only to Sisenna.
- SEBILE: the Lexica take no note of the meaning 'saddle,' found in *Pan.* 4 24 4.
- SOMNIO, II: in *Plaut. Pers.* 2 3 7 the sense is 'I no more dreamt that,' without any suggestion of folly. In such cases as *Amph.* 2 2 65 (*vigilans somniat*) the idea is always that of talking foolishly, and in this sense P. always uses the word either absolutely or with an interrogative pronoun (*quid?* or *quae?* except for *Curc.* 4 3 14, 'quos tu mihi luscios libertos, quos Summanos somnias?').
- TETRICUS: L.S.'s *têtr-* (s.v. TAETRICUS) should be *têtr-*. The first syllable is generally short in poetry.
2. TOTUS: a surprising omission (both in L.S. and in Forcell.) in the case of so rare a word is *Lucr.* 6 652, 'nec tota pars homo terrai quota totius unus.'
- UNDETRIGINTA: the dictionaries refer only to *Vitruvius* and *Macrobius*. See *Livy* 22 49 16.

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

University of Sheffield.

A PHOCISM IN AESCHYLUS?

ἄμφω δὲ φωνὴν ἤσσαν Παρησίαδα,
γλώσσης αὐτὴν Φωκίδος μμιμένον.

Aesch. *Cho.* 563 f.

ORESTES is speaking of himself and Pylades. Does he mean only some brogue or (as Verrall and Tucker would render αὐτὴν) some pitch, which is not shown in the written words of what he says to the porter and to his mother? Those words 'are, of course, Attic', says Tucker; a bold assertion about any passage in Aeschylus, even in his trimeters. Is ἐκπέραμα Attic, or δειρ' ἀπειρύγην πόδα (ll. 655, 676)? That word and that phrase, however, are doubtless not Phocian but Aeschylean, for he was an innovator in word and phrase. But what of κίεις (680)? Outside Aeschylus the verb occurs nowhere in Attic apart from Plato's fanciful derivation of κίνησις: ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ κίειν· ξενικὸν δὲ τοῦνομα, 'an unattic word'. Even in Aeschylus the verb occurs thrice only besides; two of the examples are melic; two are imperative, κίε, one is optative, κίσι. Both κίε and κίσι can be aorist, as can every form of the verb in Homer: but κίεις is of the present tense. 'Le présent . . . est sans doute une création poétique', says Meillet—a 'Parnassian' word, then, in one sense: but why not in another sense—a Parnassian or Phocian word?

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

JOSEPHUS, *ANT. JUD.* XVIII 6, 5 § 172.¹

τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς συγχωρεῖν (ἐφη ὁ Τιβέριος) τοῖς ἀπαξ εἰς αὐτὰς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταστάσιν αἰδοῦς προμηθεῖα τῶν ὑποτελών. φύσει μὲν γὰρ εἶναι πᾶσαν ἡγεμονίαν αἰκείαν τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν, τὰς δὲ μὴ παγίους . . . καὶ μεϊζόνως ἐξοτρύνειν ἐπὶ κλοπαῖς τοὺς ἔχοντας.

THE text of the former sentence is intolerable for two reasons. 1. συγχωρεῖν gives the wrong sense. We require, not 'Tiberius granted the provinces to those whom he had once appointed', but 'T. allowed those he had once appointed to provinces to keep them'. 2. αἰδοῦς is equally absurd whether construed with προμηθεῖα ('from a merciful foresight for') or with ὑποτελών ('out of regard for the provincials' loyalty'). Both

¹ My attention was drawn to the difficulties of this passage by Mr. M. P. Charlesworth of St. John's College.

difficulties disappear if, for αἰδοῦς, we read αἰδούν, a word which, according to Thackeray's *Lexicon*, fascicule 1, occurs thrice in *A.J.* XVIII-XIX 275, the work of the 'Thucydidean hack', and five times elsewhere in Josephus. For αἰδούς with the meaning 'for life', compare φυγὴ αἰδούς; that this is actually the sense required here is proved by § 170: ἡγεμόσι τε καὶ ἐπιτρόποις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ σταλείων οὐδεμία ἦν διαδοχή, ὥστε μὴ φθαίειν τετελευτηκότας.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

TAM MAGNUS AGAIN.

THERE are very few instances of *tam magnus* in the speeches and dialogues of Cicero.¹ The expression is even rarer in his letters. There is one instance in *ad Fam.* V, xi, 2: 'tu tamen ei velim scribas, ut nullam rem neque *tam magnam* neque *tam parvam* putet quae mihi aut difficilis aut parum me digna videatur'; here the requirement of a precise antithesis to 'tam parvam' may explain why 'tam magnam' is preferred to 'tantam'. Another instance is *Att.* VIII, xi, 1: 'quod me magno animi motu perturbatum putas, sum equidem sed non *tam magno* quam tibi videor'. Occasionally *tantus* appears to spoil symmetry; e.g. *ad Q.F.* I, i, 22: 'quod si haec lenitas grata est, ubi tanta adrogantia est, tam immoderata libertas, tam infinita hominum licentia. . .'. And cf. *ad Fam.* III, x, 10: 'quae ut omittam tam multa atque tanta. . .'.
The expression appears in Silver Age prose. There are four instances in Tacitus (*Ann.* XI, 36, 3; *Agr.* 18, 7; *Dial.* 1, 2; *Germ.* 37, 1), and more in the *Epp. Mor.* of Seneca (7, 6; 9, 8; 21, 4; 22, 9; 59, 9; 71, 9; 71, 11; 72, 11; 75, 3; 88, 35; 90, 29; 91, 9; 95, 18; 124, 1). Among the poets I have noted one instance in *Ciris* 416, two in Martial (I, 12, 10; VI, 36, 1), and three in Statius (*Sil.* IV, 6, 43; V, 1, 112; *Theb.* V, 534).

W. A. LAIDLAW.

University of St. Andrews.

¹ Cf. *C.R.* XLIX, 2. There it was stated that no instance is cited from Caesar. Menge and Preuss, indeed, cite *B.C.* I, 52: 'et tam paucis diebus magna erat rerum facta commutatio'; but Merguet takes *tam paucis* together, as the order of the words suggests.

REVIEWS

GREEK IDEALS AND MODERN LIFE.

Sir R. W. LIVINGSTONE: *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*. Pp. x+175. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 6s.

THIS book, based on lectures delivered at Oberlin College, Ohio, is one which many scholars must have desired to

write, but few could write so well. Its thesis, put briefly, is that Europe, which is apparently abandoning Christianity, and therefore in moral chaos, would do well to take counsel of the other main source of its civilization, Greece; and in his first chapter the author gives

reasons for thinking that in spite of the dwindling number of Greek scholars the influence of Greek thought is actually increasing. In the succeeding chapters he shows how in its different spheres, science, economics, politics, religion, modern life looks in the light of Greek practice and theory, and the comparison is often painful. The ground is familiar to students, but the case is presented with unusual breadth of view and knowledge, and in a form intelligible to any educated man. The statement is the more forcible because the author is careful not to overstate his case, and indicates, in his last chapter, on 'Christianity and Hellenism,' and elsewhere, the limitations of Greek thought.

The book, as might be expected, gives everywhere evidence of sound knowledge, but here and there, naturally, there is room for a difference of opinion. In particular many students will think that the author underestimates the value of the traditional religion of Greece: on that point Zieliński, though he overestimates, is perhaps nearer the truth. The actual slips are very few, but Juvenal is misquoted on p. 161; Cobbett appears in odd com-

pany on p. 31, and may be a slip or misprint for Cobden; and if Eratosthenes calculated the earth's *circumference* at 7,850 miles, he was not so near as the context seems to imply. And near the bottom of p. 88 'the former' is apparently a slip for 'the latter.' Here and there again allusions no doubt clear to the author will puzzle some of his readers; e.g. on p. 42, if Greek is one of 'the two great literatures of the West,' they may wonder which is the other. And on p. 70, when they read that 'the *ἀρετή* of a man is not that of a woman; and politicians require a separate variety,' many, it is to be feared, will take the last remark as a hit at politicians. Apart from these and a few other ambiguous phrases, the style is clear and vigorous, and is enlivened by interesting and sometimes provocative *obiter dicta*. Of these space only allows us to quote this on Euripides (p. 117): 'Sensitive, critical, unconstructive, slightly querulous, an artist turned moralist, a moralist without a creed, he belongs to the age and type of Galsworthy.'

F. R. EARP.

Queen Mary College, London.

LATIN IN EDUCATION.

Latin: Its Place and Value in Education.

By C. W. VALENTINE, M.A., D. PHIL.

Pp. x+166. London: University of London Press, 1935. Cloth, 6s.

PROFESSOR VALENTINE in this book examines the present position of Latin as a subject in the secondary-school curriculum, and analyses the values claimed for it as a normal part of a higher education and as a necessary qualification for a degree in Arts at most English universities. He writes as a psychologist, but has had the experience of teaching Latin to schoolboys so effectively from the standpoint of examination results that he was offered the senior classical mastership of the school; yet he claims only 'modest attainments in classical studies.' He argues fairly and is anxious that his book shall not be regarded as an attack upon Latin; he is indeed convinced that, for the right pupils, a classical

education is of supreme value. The only part of his argument that is purely destructive deals with the still prevalent belief that Latin can give a *general* mental training or can teach pupils to think clearly or reason accurately *in general*. This disbelief in the transfer of training is, with comparatively slight modifications, universal among psychologists, and applies not only to Latin but to any school subject that justifies its place in the curriculum by claiming to provide mental gymnastics. And it does not need a psychological argument, but merely a glance at the Latin exercises of a B class at any stage of the secondary-school course, or a scrutiny of the marks obtained for Latin at any School Certificate examination, to show that a large proportion of Latin pupils are not in fact learning, much less transferring, habits of accuracy and clear thinking. For this kind of pupil too,

whose Latin ends with a pass, or a failure, in School Certificate, Professor Valentine doubts if Latin affords any of the aesthetic training obtainable by those who pursue classics longer and more successfully, and he quotes an impressive list of poets and classical scholars who share his doubts. He argues that Latin is an indispensable foundation for advanced work in certain other fields, but maintains that this argument cannot be used without some regard to the proportion of pupils to whom it is likely to apply.

If this is not the case against Latin in the secondary school, it is a case, and a strong case, against Latin for as high or as ill-chosen a proportion of pupils (judging by their results) as nowadays take it. The book ends with a strong plea for more Latin for fewer pupils; if a careful selection for linguistic ability

were made during the second year of the secondary-school course, a small picked class could do more than cover the ground for School Certificate Latin in the remaining three years, since it would not be held back as almost every class is today by pupils whose progress is slow and unsure. Moreover, under such a scheme, just as the rest of the school would not offer Latin, so the Latinists could drop at least one subject of those normally offered, using the time gained either for more Latin or—still more attractive prospect, though not mentioned in the book—for Greek to be taken by the whole of such a picked class. Options and selection are difficult matters in small schools, but in a school of normal size some such plan ought to be possible.

J. F. DUFF.

University of Manchester.

HOMERIC ESSAYS.

ALEXANDER SHEWAN, M.A., LL.D.: *Homeric Essays*. Pp. ix+456; 1 sketch-map, 1 photograph. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Cloth, 21s.

In reading this collection of reprinted articles I find in myself a sort of affection for Mr. Shewan like that felt by our soldiers for 'Fritz' or 'Jerry' in the opposite trenches. He so loves his Homer, he reads such masses of magazine articles, and he is such 'a bonny fechter.' He loves to fire his shot-gun and see in imagination us meaner critics, from Leaf to Wilamowitz, turn and fly in silence 'like a pack of Indian jackals' (p. 370). We have here no less than eleven diatribes against Dörpfeld and Brewster on the Ithaca question; twelve on the sins of Leaf as regards the Catalogue; five to prove that Scheria is Corfu, and all inconsistent passages merely jokes at the expense of Alcinous; only one on *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, but a long one, with a collection of all the hard things said about the book in reviews, including one for which the writer sent me a generous apology.

Mr. Shewan is not merely a 'unitarian'; we are all unitarians in one sense or another; he is a Fundamentalist, and

objects to criticism of the sacred book much as they do in Dayton, Tennessee. It is this that makes his work, however clever and painstaking, so unhelpful. After all, there is a problem to explain. I still feel it difficult to believe (without evidence) that about the year 1000 B.C., when to the best of our knowledge there was no Greek literature, a single miraculously gifted man composed for an audience unable to read two poems much too long to be listened to, and then contrived to secure that his text should remain unaltered while exposed to all the vicissitudes of competitive recitation through many unlettered centuries. My own belief is that we cannot know exactly what happened with the poems, but that we can, by comparison of other traditional oral literature and much use of the historical imagination, conjecture the kind of thing that may or even must have happened. Most scholars now agree that the poems are 'remaniements,' containing combinations of older material. But who knows how such rehandling was done, within what limits of verbal alteration provided the story was kept, or of story-alteration provided the wording was kept, of *Sagenverschiebung* or *Namenverschiebung*

or original fiction, while the desire for accurate information strove with the desire for novelty?

Take the question of the islands. Is it necessary to state simply that Ithaca is Thiaki or that Scheria is Corfu, and to insist that every detail shall be consistent with the facts of those islands? If there are magic ships and magic palaces in Scheria, if Odysseus' home is 'low down in the sea, furthest of all toward the darkness,' is there anything very wrong in supposing that relics of old folk-tale or myth are mixed with the tradition?

Similarly with the epic gods and heroes: should we not remember that they are not persons; that they are cloud-shapes of imagination or tradition, none the less so if they bear sometimes the names of real persons or get attached to real historical events? To invent is often easier than to remember; to remember confusedly easier than to remember exactly. In the Agamemnon of Greek tradition one element apparently is the King of the Akhaiusha or 'Peoples of the Sea' who took Troy, another is the Senior King of Sparta, who with his brothers has his famous tomb in Amyclae and goes home round Cape Malea; another perhaps the Old King of the regular mythical Year-Sequence; another the chieftain of Mycenae. Why not admit the possibility of such fusions of tradition or fiction instead of trying to torture them into historic consistency? Or again, why not recognize that the Catalogue is a poem of unknown date and origin, which has been embodied in our Iliad and in many points modified to suit its new position

much as happened to the similar ancient Catalogue which is inserted into the *Chanson de Roland*, differing from the main poem both in style and in its picture of the world?

However, it is pleasant to record the many points on which I agree with Mr. Shewan. I agree in gravely doubting Dr. von Wendrin's alleged view that 'Troy and the Odyssey were glorious events in old Prussian history, falsified by the Jew Homer'; in not being much impressed when travellers discover the detailed landmarks of Homer's Ithaca in Leucas, or Trapani, or Ithaca itself; or those of Scheria in Crete, Gadeira, the Canaries, Trapani, and Palestine. I agree with his reluctance to draw conclusions from the repetitions in Homer. Mr. Milman Parry's studies of this point have made all of us—including, I hope, Mr. Shewan—recognize some new facts. I agree, in general, that there is a 'oneness' in the traditional Homeric language, and that Kynaithos of Chios (for whom my admiration rises year by year!) might well write verses of the most antique appearance in one place and in another put very 'late-looking' verses in the middle of an ancient episode. I am pleased to see that Mr. Shewan admits the possibility that the old Homeric hexameter was polished up and made to comply with stricter rules by some late reviser, and I cordially agree with his criticism of the attempts of Samuel Butler—recently imitated by Lawrence—to turn the *Odyssey* from a great poem into a modern prose story.

GILBERT MURRAY.

Oxford.

THE OXFORD TEXT OF PINDAR.

Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis: recognovit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit C. M. BOWRA. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 8s. 6d. THE appearance in England of a moderately priced text of Pindar, in the neat and handy format of the O.C.T., is to be welcomed, provided the editor has done his work passably well. But Mr. Bowra's work is more than passable;

it is a contribution to our understanding of the author, less important than that of Schroeder, to which he refers the reader for more information on certain points, but nevertheless with a value of its own, derived from the scholarship and good sense which has gone to the preparation of it.

As the introduction explains, the foundation of the text is Mr. Bowra's

own collation of the seven principal MSS., together with certain minor aids, some not previously available. Among these should be mentioned a Berlin papyrus, made accessible to him by Dr. Schubart, and some notes left by the lamented Professor Mair and transmitted by his widow. The latter contained a few emendations quite worth considering, the former at least one new and interesting reading (*Ol.* ii, 52, ἀφροσυν for the vulgate δυσφροσύνας or -άν, confirming a conjecture of the editor's founded on the schol., ἡ ἀνοια καὶ ἡ ἀφροσύνη), and a confirmation of Pauw's supplement in *Ol.* ii, 76, where it plainly reads μέγας for the γὰς of all other authorities. The use of the evidence is eclectic, as it should be in an author like Pindar, who has always been read chiefly by scholars, and therefore from copies which would contain marginal readings and corrections enough to prevent the formation of the well-defined families postulated by some editors. Mr. Bowra rejects the view that C has no independent authority. He is probably right, but of the passages he adduces to confirm his opinion, two have no evidential value (*Ol.* iv, 8, ἀλλ' ὦ Ζεῦ C, ἀλλὰ Ζεῦ cett.; the addition of ὦ, right or wrong, to a vocative is characteristic of mediaeval sciolists, cf. *Nem.* ix, 31, ὦ Ζεῦ D, Ζεῦ the rest, rightly: ix, 13, παλαίσμασιν C, παλαίσμασι cett., which might easily be a Byzantine's metrical correction, cf. i, 53, λέλογχεν Byz., λέλογχε codd. vet.). He does not reject the readings of the Byzantine *deteriores* without examination, rightly pointing out that some of them may be derived from good MSS. now lost. For safety's sake, however, he treats all their variants as conjectures, to be received or not purely on their merits. His attitude towards conjectures is on the whole reasonable, and several good suggestions of the older editors which had been neglected by later students appear in the text. Of his own corrections he has been sparing, seldom or never trying to fill gaps in the papyrus fragments; the reviewer gathers that missing-word puzzles do not much attract him. In *Pyth.* vi, 50, he suggests ἄρχεις for the metrically and otherwise impossible ὀργαῖς πάσαις

of the MSS. Certainly this makes sense and metre; but how did so common a word become corrupted? Of new conjectures by other scholars, perhaps the neatest is in *Nem.* iii, 14, where he prints, with Mair, παλαίφατον εἶραν for the MSS. ἀγοράν, that is to say, restores the word of which it is highly probable our authorities give us the gloss. He has himself corrected on similar lines in *Nem.* x, 5, where he reads Αἰγύπτιοιο κατέκτιθεν ἄστη for Αἰγύπτω κατῴκισθεν. Perhaps the worst conjecture he has admitted is de Jongh's ὕμνιν for μή μιν in *Ol.* xi, 17, which upsets the intricate beauty of the construction; 'I warrant that when ye come to it, ye shall find it no inhospitable people nor unversed in things good and fair.' Garrod's μεταύδασεν for μετάλ(λ)ασ(σ)ε(ν) in *Ol.* vi, 62 has a good chance of being right. In *Ol.* xiii, 107, where he follows Bergk in reading Ἀρκάσι βάσσαις for Ἀρκάσιν ἀνάσσων, it may be doubted if anything more is needed than to omit two letters and write Ἀρκάσιν ἄσσον, though the latter word is not elsewhere found in Pindar.

But the most debatable ground is, as usual, the group of departures from tradition which justify themselves on metrical arguments. Here of course several major and a hundred minor alterations are necessary on any conceivable theory; but Mr. Bowra, who argues in his preface for very strict correspondence, hardly allowing more than υυ for – occasionally and *syllaba anceps* at the end of a verse,¹ is thereby led into accepting some readings which seem to the reviewer both needless and clumsy. In *Ol.* i, 104, the chances that Maas' εόντα for the ἄμα of the MSS. is right are surely negligible; and the gain is but a more exact correspondence of strophe and antistrophe, whereas the MS. reading, interpreted, with Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, as ἀμά, gives –υυ– for –υ–υ, no more inexact than –υυ– for –υ– which Mr. Bowra

¹ Mr. Bowra does well in restoring Boeckh's long lines, which are based on an intelligible principle and beg no questions; he has broken up some of the longest of them into cola, for which he claims no infallibility, to improve the appearance of the page and make the reading more convenient.

rightly allows in *Pyth.* iii, 6, τέκτονα νοδυνίας ἄμερον γνι αρ κέος Ἀσ κλαπιόν, answering ἀμπλακίαισι φρενῶν ἄλλον αἰνῆσεν γάμον κρύβδαν πατρός. When Schroeder, in *Pyth.* i, 77, keeps ἐρέω τὰν πρὸ Κιθαιρώνας μάχαν instead of emending, with Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, whom Mr. Bowra follows, to ἄρα τὰν . . . μαχᾶν, he does precisely the same thing. Now and then, as *Nem.* vii, 61, it is hard to see why an emendation (here Hartung's easy and probable inversion of two words) is relegated to the notes instead of being put

in the text; and at times a doubtful, or even certainly corrupt, lection is left standing with a warning *uix sanum* in the apparatus.

Suppose Mr. Bowra completely wrong on everyone of these and similar points, the reader will be obliged to correct perhaps one line in a hundred. How many editors of Pindar can put in a claim to be considered right in 99 per cent. of their readings?

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

PROMETHEUS AND AGAMEMNON IN ENGLISH PROSE.

The *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, translated by T. G. TUCKER, C.M.G., Litt.D. Pp. 63. The *Prometheus Bound*, translated by the same. Pp. 49. Melbourne: University Press (London, Milford), 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d. each.

THE problems set by Aeschylus to a translator are ultimately insoluble, but partial solutions have in their very diversity a fascination of their own. It is easy for the critic to point out where these are inadequate; their merit will lie in their power to illuminate certain facets of the unapproachable original. A prose translation of such a poet renounces any claim to be judged as an acting version; it may aspire to be readable for its own sake, or, like Jebb's translation of Sophocles, to convey with some exactness what the poet appears to have said and meant. Professor Tucker's versions have not the speed or style of Verrall's prose, but they are free from Verrall's occasional extravagances of individual interpretation, and without being woodenly literal keep a high degree of fidelity to the Greek text—though who shall decide wherein lies fidelity to a poet whose imagery is so elusive that the one translator endeavours to capture μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος, δηξιθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος with 'whose gentle eye shot that soft bolt which pricks from the heart the flower of love,' while the other renders 'soft-glancing eyes, a soul-teasing blossom of desire'?

Some criticisms suggest themselves.

A reader's first curiosity is for the great passages. "There is the sea, and who shall e'er exhaust it?" Is it not rather 'a sea'? And 'e'er' is gratuitous; moreover, these occasional archaisms ('i'faith,' 'I trow,' 'natheless,' 'he spake his rede') have an adventitious air. 'Ares the money-changer whose coins are bodies, Ares whose scales are weighted with fighting spears' blurs the figure; 'coins' is an alien intrusion, and the second phrase of the Greek means simply 'in battle he holds his scale.' Epithets are an ungrateful problem, but if δυσδάμαρτος is to be 'ill-wived' surely αἰολοστόμους χρησμούς should not be merely 'ambiguous oracles.' And the μνάμων μῆνις should keep its muster-roll of epithets at any cost; this is prophetic utterance and intentionally ἐκπληκτικόν. An Aeschylean scholar of Professor Tucker's eminence is entitled to his own view on disputed points of text and interpretation, but it would have been helpful to know what text was being followed, and it seems a pity to retain the meaningless ἀ δὰ of *P.V.* 568 after Wilamowitz's brilliant emendation of the passage. Of the new readings proposed, the stop after αἴσιον in *Ag.* 104 is metrically disastrous and leaves γάρ strangely placed in the next sentence, while ὡς in *Ag.* 369 breaks the uniform purity of the iambics. In *P.V.* 115 προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής is not 'swept dimly o'er me'; in 827-9 Prometheus is surely saying in effect 'I will leave out most of the tale and start near the

end
can
T
sign
out
tisa
this
Fro

JEAN
la
m
cr
'P
40

(1) I
—D
méta
en d
moti
entir
there
'leit
much
(223-
does
Pers.
to fin
Agam
to the
law-s
la tes
défaul
natur
ing ob
in Ch
most
thems

Par
—D. a
of the
can be
ficatio
ena, F
(Agric
Private
Family
Life
Medici
Games
(Justic
The m
brief c
from e

NO. C

end'; in 835 τῶνδε προσαίνει σέ τι; cannot be part of the oracle's address.

The short introductions explain the significance of the themes and the main outlines of action and characters. Partisans of the *Prometheus* may feel that this estimate does it less than justice. From his stage directions Professor

Tucker appears to reject the theory that Prometheus was a wooden effigy on the stage. It is more difficult to believe that the Oceanids arrived each in a separate car.

On p. 16 of the *Prometheus* for 'winds' read 'wings.'

A. M. DALE.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

METAPHORS AND MEDICAL WORDS IN AESCHYLUS.

JEAN DUMORTIER: (1) *Les images dans la poésie d'Eschyle*; (2) *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et des écrits hippocratiques*. Pp. iv + 283; iii + 91. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1935. Paper, 40 and 20 francs.

(1) PART I. Les métaphores principales.—D. attempts to find in each play 'une métaphore plus importante qui apparaît en divers passages et semble le "leit-motiv" visuel du drame'. He is not entirely successful. In several plays there seems little to justify the title 'leit-motiv': in *Supp.* there is not very much to support the chief passage (223-8); 'le harnois de Prométhée' does not work very well for *P.V.*; in *Pers.* it can hardly have been surprising to find several references to a yoke; in *Agam.* the net-metaphors are tabulated to the exclusion of the equally significant law-suit metaphors. *S.c.T.* (navire dans la tempête) and *Eum.* (la meute en défaut) respond to this treatment more naturally; and there are some interesting observations on the snake-metaphors in *Cho.* In general, there is little that most readers have not observed for themselves.

Part II. Les métaphores secondaires.—D. assembles most (by no means all) of the Aeschylean metaphors which can be arranged in the following classification.—1. Nature (Natural Phenomena, Flora, Fauna). 2. Economic Life (Agriculture, Trades, Commerce). 3. Private Life (The House, Dress, Food, Family, Human Body). 4. Intellectual Life (Music and Drawing, Books, Medicine). 5. Religious Life (Sacrifices, Games). 6. The Army. 7. Institutions (Justice, Government, Social Classes). The metaphors are quoted in full, with brief comment and some illustrations from earlier Greek poetry. Not very

much that is new or interesting emerges. The purpose is to show us 'quelles étaient les préoccupations d'un Athénien du siècle de Périclès, quelle était sa tournure d'esprit': but we find little of importance that is not already known in more detail from other sources. The large classes of Aeschylean metaphors which do not readily fall into D.'s groups are not discussed at all (*Ag.* 505, 1020, 1356-7, *Cho.* 805 and a great many more).

D.'s treatment of metaphors is often unconvincing in detail: e.g. among many others, *Supp.* 620, *P.V.* 395 6, *Ag.* 1260-1, 1594 (χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας must surely refer to hands cut off between the wrists and knuckles: the fingers are the *teeth* of the comb, not the comb itself): in Φ 495 τῇ means 'there,' not 'for her'; in *Eur. Med.* 258 μεθορμίσασθαι does not mean 'jeter l'ancre.' Readers will be disturbed by numerous misprints and scores of wrong accents and breathings: and there is no excuse nowadays for printing eight lines of Alcaeus (p. 30) with an almost total disregard of the Lesbian dialect.

(2) Part I. 1. Le corps humain.—D.'s method is to expound the definitions of certain Hippocratic medical terms, and then to show how far Aeschylus' uses of the same words agree or disagree with the definitions. It gradually becomes clear that D. thinks of his Hippocratic quotations rather as sources than as parallels: and on this point—quite apart from the difficulty of dating the Hippocratic passages—he is wholly unconvincing. I cannot find a single Aeschylean word or passage in this section which could not easily have been written thus by an observant man who had read Homer, seen victims sacrificed, and fought in battles where

men are slain. 'Il serait surprenant qu'Eschyle ait traversé le monde les yeux fermés,' as D. himself observes elsewhere. Even as mere parallels the Hippocratic quotations are not as a rule very illuminating: little is gained by observing that *θρόμβος αἵματος* means the same thing in both writers, that both normally use *θυμός* as the seat of the emotions, or that both describe the colour of the heart as dark; and it needed no ghost of a Homeric or a Hippocratic patient come from the grave to tell Aeschylus that a thunderbolt in the diaphragm is likely to prove fatal. The plain fact is that Aeschylus, like Homer, did not eschew anatomical detail where it was appropriate, and that his use of anatomical terms occasionally coincides with the Hippocratic use. No plausible case can be made for a relation of dependence either way. The fifth-century doctors did not create their medical parlance out of thin air. They took certain words from common usage and made them into technical terms by limiting their spheres of application: Aeschylus also took the words from common usage, but did not (far from it, as D.'s exposition proves) limit

their spheres of application. In other words, if the technical terms of medicine existed as such in Aeschylus' time (and there is no proof of this), Aeschylus is not yet conscious of their technicality.

2. Les états morbides, and 3. Le traitement.—Here again there seems nothing specially Hippocratic about A.'s use of such words as *νόσος*, *ἐμείν*, *ἔλκος*, *ἀσθμα*, *φάρμακον* etc. Nearly all the words discussed occur in earlier Greek literature, and A.'s uses of them seem wholly intelligible without any reference to the technical parlance of Greek medicine. 4. Le climat.—Discussion of *P.V.* 454-8 and *Eum.* 904-6, unconvincing in detail.

Part II. 1. Le cas d'Io.—Some interesting parallels from the Corpus Hippocraticum: but I can find nothing more than the natural coincidence of thought and expression where two writers are describing similar maladies. 2. La maladie d'Oreste.—D. maintains that *λειχήν*, with which Orestes was threatened, was white leprosy.

Throughout both books, for Lindwood read Linwood.

D. L. PAGE.

Christ Church, Oxford.

THE ORIGINS OF TRAGEDY.

BENIAMINO STUMPO: *Le Origini della Tragedia*. Pp. 105. Milan, etc.:

'Dante Alighieri', 1935. Paper, L. 5.

THE general character of this book may be inferred from the fact that Dionysus is treated as a solar deity, whose cult is purely Cretan in origin; and that tragedy is derived from the procession of the God in the *currus navalis*, the God wrapped in his mantle representing the sun veiled in clouds; he is lost, and therein is tragedy: there is a *ζήτησις* by the satyrs; he is found, and therefore tragedy ends in satyr-play; and at some point the god in the car himself utters a lament—our author is here very obscure—and this gives us the *κομμός*, the kernel of tragedy. The author does not explain how the satyrs can have lost the god in the car, when two of them are in the car with him, or how he gets over the fact that the procession depicted on the vases (we

know nothing else about it) is obviously not *κομμός* but *κῶμος*—on the way to a sacrifice. He does, however, compare the *currus navalis* with the death-ship of Balder. The Titans in the Dionysiac legend are clouds; so are the Maenads (at least when they are not vines); the difference between them is due to the different climates of Crete and Thrace. The dithyramb is the representation first of joy, then of loss, *ζήτησις* and recovery; the fifteenth Idyll of Theocritus and Virgil's Fifth Eclogue (*Daphnis*) are dithyrambs in the strict sense. (It is unfortunate that no literary or ritual form embodying this sequence is ever called dithyramb.) It is argued that the presence of satyrs in the *Cyclops* and *Ichneutae* proves that (especially in the *ζήτησις* and recovery) these plays reproduce the original form of tragedy. There is no thorough or critical treatment of sources, and (apart

from
to
Ea
tha
tre
gra
In
—

E.
A
c
a
v
'N
of
tain
seve
tem
atte
stor
reac
and
M
fied
wish
pag
did
Wes
bea
a d
vers
by
I
poet
it v
Sch
that
nus.
of
Scal
lege
earl
any

HE
V
vo
he
L
lin
R

from passing allusions to Ridgeway and to the Italian translation of Murray's *Euripides and his Age*) there is no sign that the author has read any English treatment of his subject, or has really grappled with the problems involved. In regard to the chief questions raised—the nature of the primitive dithyramb,

the relation of tragedy to the Mysteries, the way in which hero-stories came into tragedy, etc.—the book has nothing to say which is sufficiently well supported by evidence to make it worth while to spend time upon it.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

HERO AND LEANDER.

E. H. BLAKENEY: Musaeus: *Hero and Leander*. The Greek text with introductory note, annotations, translation and index. Pp. 52. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Boards, 6s.

'No complete edition of the epic-idyll of Musaeus has, so far as I can ascertain, been printed in this country, though several verse-renderings have been attempted. The present volume is an attempt to provide lovers of the old story with a tolerable Greek text, a reasonably accurate prose-rendering, and a sufficient Commentary.'

Mr. Blakeney's modest claim is justified by the present edition, though I wish he had printed his translation on pages opposite to the Greek text, as he did with his *Twenty-four hymns of the Western Church*. The Greek type is beautiful, the translation satisfying, and a due meed of praise is rendered to the version begun by Marlowe and finished by Chapman.

It is strange that any editor of this poem should write an introduction to it without mentioning the name of Schwabe who, in 1876, finally proved that the writer knew and imitated Nonnus. (Schwabe followed an indication of Casaubon—but even Julius Caesar Scaliger had still attributed it to the legendary poet-seer Musaeus of the earliest days of the Greek epic. Could anyone but a Christian, or one familiar

with Christian language, have written γαστήρ ἢ σ' ἐδόχευσε μακαράτη?)

We can date 'Musaeus' with some accuracy: for if he was later than Nonnus, he was earlier than Agathias and Paul the Silentiary, who exchanged poems about the middle of the sixth century A.D. which show a knowledge of τὰ καθ' Ἡρὸν καὶ Λέανδρον (Anth. Pal. V 263, 292, 293). Agathias had complained that, while he was studying law on one side of the Bosphorus, the object of his affections was on the other: to which Paul the Silentiary rather cynically replied that Leander had to swim, but 'you, my boy, always have the ferry'—σοὶ δέ, φίλος, παρέασι καὶ ὀλκάδες. We can therefore fairly place our poet at 500 A.D. or a little later. An investigation of his sources would take me too far afield, and I would refer the curious to the elaborate indications in Rohde's *Der Griechische Roman*, 133 sqq.

Mr. Blakeney's edition, and the helps to understanding which he provides in this book, have made me read the poem very carefully again, and it will doubtless have the same effect on many others. But I cannot become very excited about it: it has not the metrical skill of Nonnus, and it strikes me as a school-piece throughout. I think that when I next want to ponder on Hero and Leander, I shall return to Ovid and Marlowe.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

THE PRESOCRATICS

HERMANN DIELS: *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Griechisch und deutsch von Hermann Diels. Fünfte Auflage herausgegeben von WALTHER KRANZ. Lieferungen 1-3. Pp. xv+482. Berlin: Weidmann, 1934-5. Paper, RM. 11, 10, 10.

DIELS' successor in the editorship of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* has efficiently performed his primary duty—the fulfilment of the changes implied, though not carried out, in the reprint of 1922. He has included the 'Nachträge' in the appropriate sections of the

work itself, and made the structural alterations already suggested by Diels: Orpheus, Hesiod, Pherecydes, and their kin now occupy their rightful position, at the beginning of the first volume. He has made other minor adjustments which were long overdue. Anaximander, for example, now possesses the five fragments which he has hitherto unaccountably been denied. Occasional slips and misprints have been corrected. In 1935, however, the accomplishment of intentions stated in 1922 is not enough. If a work like *Vorsokratiker* is to retain its value, it must be kept up to date, and therefore its editor must go beyond Diels and make changes and additions on his own account. This part of his task is recognized by Kranz, but his execution of it is somewhat disappointing. If Diels could draw sixty-two pages of 'Nachträge' from the work done in the decade that included the Great War, at least as much might have been expected from the work of the last thirteen years. Yet in Kranz's first volume the new material—to take only one aspect of the matter—would scarcely fill a page. It is of course impossible to include all the relevant information; but where the space allotted to a particular philosopher no longer corresponds to the accepted view of his importance, some extension of the original design is called for, and would be worth making even at the price of reducing quotations on other authors to references. Any student of fifth-century thought would be glad to see Zeno's twelve pages increased at the expense of Melissus' eighteen; and who would not forgo some of Epicharmus in order to have more from the *Hippocratic Corpus*—the second chapter of *Περὶ τέχνης* to illustrate the vulgarization of Eleaticism, or one of the numerous 'imitations' of Empedocles? It is high time that at least references should be given to parallels in the medical writers.

A similar conservatism shows itself in the treatment of the material already included in the fourth edition. Kranz himself has been responsible for barely half-a-dozen safe but slight emendations of the text: for the rest he has drawn somewhat cautiously on the results of

German scholarship, so that throughout the first volume there are not more than a score of textual alterations which materially affect the sense. The notes must necessarily be short, and Kranz is to be congratulated on his skill in the art of *multum in parvo*. If a criticism may be made, it is one that applies equally to the handling of the text—that too little attention has been paid to the work of scholars of other nationalities. Among all the notes added by Kranz I found only one reference to Burnet and one to the *Classical Review* representing English Presocratic studies, and no reference whatever to French scholarship. It will be regrettable if a book in such universal use loses its international character.

The least satisfactory aspect of Diels' own work was the translation of the fragments; and here it is pleasing to find that Kranz has abandoned his policy of leaving well alone, and has produced a completely new version, in almost every way (so far as I have been able to test it) a great improvement on the old. Perhaps the most important alterations on particular points are the view taken of Heraclitus' *λόγος* and the treatment of Parmenides' remarks (B3, 6, and 8) on the relation between 'thinking' and 'being'. But such fundamental changes of interpretation are not numerous in the first volume. The chief gain is in literalness and accuracy, virtues of so much importance that Kranz has rightly indulged them at the expense of style.

These three *Lieferungen* complete the first volume, which ends with the Pythagorean School. The second volume, containing the rest of the philosophers from Anaxagoras onwards and the Sophists, is promised in the near future. It is disappointing to read in the preface that no new treatment of Democritus or completion of the Sophists is being attempted, although Diels intended it, because he left no detailed instructions for its execution. But students of early Greek thought will examine with interest whatever changes have been made to justify the publication of a new edition.

H. C. BALDRY.

University College of Swansea.

THE *THEAETETUS* AND THE *SOPHIST*.

Plato's Theory of Knowledge. By F. M. CORNFORD. Pp. xiv + 336. London: Kegan Paul, 1935. Cloth, 15s.

THIS excellent book marks one more stage in the development of Platonic studies in recent years. It is not, as the title might suggest, an essay on Plato's Theory of Knowledge, but is a translation, with very full commentary interspersed in the text, of the *Theaetetus* and the *Sophist*. It thus adds one more to the impressive series of translations, editions and commentaries by various hands which have appeared in recent years. There was certainly need for studies of these two dialogues, since Campbell's work, admirable though it was, needed bringing up to date in the light of subsequent discussions. We still need similar studies of the *Politicus* and the *Philebus*, and then, perhaps, we might be considered to have enough material to begin the synthesis of all this detailed work.

It would be difficult to over-praise the translation. It is as readable as Jowett, but gives a much better idea of the original Greek. It might be possible to criticize the choice of English equivalents for certain of the more or less technical terms. I do not feel quite satisfied with 'perception' for *αἰσθησις*. 'Sense-perception,' which is used sometimes in the commentary, would be better. Still less do I like 'judgement,' with its technical, logical associations, for *δόξα* in the *Theaetetus*. 'Opinion,' I think, would be better, 'belief' better still: perhaps just 'thinking' would be as good a translation as any. But no translation could be expected to satisfy everyone on such points.

The commentary, too, is excellent, clear in exposition and judicious in its opinions on difficult points. In work which is so largely a matter of detail it would be difficult to single out particular points either for praise or criticism. I like particularly the exposition of the reason for the absence of the Forms in

the main argument of the *Theaetetus* and the demonstration that the *Sophist*, by introducing them, meets the difficulties of the earlier dialogue. I am very glad, too, to see that Professor Cornford will have nothing to do with 'propositions' in the interpretation of Plato. The difficulties which I feel profoundly in the status of the *μέγιστα γένη* are not resolved. But it must be admitted that on the face of it Professor Cornford's account of them is adequate. He certainly has good grounds for refusing to identify them with the categories.

I should be inclined to question some of his judgements on historical points. I am not convinced by his interpretation of Protagoras' views, and find no difficulty in accepting Plato's account as historically accurate in its essential features. I can quite well believe that Plato would develop and add, but I cannot picture him ascribing to Protagoras views entirely different from those that he put forward in his book. Again, while I find his account of the materialists mentioned in the *Sophist* very convincing, I cannot be satisfied with his views of the *εἰδῶν φίλοι*. They seem to me to be spoken of in a way which suggests much more of a specific group or school than Professor Cornford will allow. I am not prepared to fight to the last for any particular identification of this group. But I am as convinced as one can be in these matters that Professor Cornford is wrong in thinking that it was intended to include Plato himself at any period of his thought, in spite of the weighty list of names that can be quoted in support of this view.

There will probably always be differences of opinion on such details as these. But they do nothing to detract from the appreciation that everyone must feel for an admirable piece of work, which performs an indispensable service for Platonic studies.

G. C. FIELD.

University of Bristol.

ESSAYS ON THE PLATONIC EPISTLES.

GLENN R. MORROW: *Studies in the Platonic Epistles, with a Translation and Notes*. Pp. 234. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1935. Paper, \$3.

THIS volume appears in the series *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*. It contains a number of essays, varying in length, on matters connected with the *Epistles*, besides a translation of the whole collection (a faithful rendering, based on Burnet's text, and on the whole very readable) with numerous critical or explanatory footnotes. The chapters which make up the larger part of the book deal with matters of authenticity, with the philosophical and political content, and with the historical background of the letters. In connection with the question of authenticity, the writer makes a detailed and thorough examination of the conflicting traditions in Sicilian history; in spite of unsolved problems, and in particular the discrepancies between Plutarch and the *Epistles*, he finds no reason to doubt the genuineness of the main part of the collection. He strongly supports VII and VIII, to which he gives most attention; he rejects II, and is not sure about III and XIII. Problems connected with these five letters are severally treated in short chapters. An

interesting study of the theory of knowledge in VII aims at reconciling that letter with the dialogues; the suggestion of ἐκλαμψις, as supplementing dialectic, is correlated with Plato's strong tendency elsewhere to combine with pure logic the element of 'moral and aesthetic experience.' The chapter entitled 'Plato and Greek Politics' is again an attempt to harmonize VII and VIII with the dialogues and with the main tradition of Plato's activities; 'The Experiment with Dionysius II' is a further contribution on this side. Shorter studies deal with Dion's career and Plato's relation to his party.

Mr. Morrow has marshalled evidence and opinion with great pains; he is scrupulously fair in making his deductions, and in suspending judgment where necessary. His own conclusions would appear more clearly if his style were more concise; the book is indeed somewhat overloaded with words throughout. It is, nevertheless, not only a sound piece of work in itself but a considerable addition to the literature of the *Epistles*. The format is excellent except for the quite inadequate paper binding.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

ARISTOTLE.

H. RACKHAM: Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution, The Eudemian Ethics, On Virtues and Vices*. With an English translation. Pp. vii + 505. London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1935. Cloth, 10s. net (leather, 12s. 6d.).

MR RACKHAM's new instalment of Aristotle in the Loeb Library combines somewhat oddly the *Athenian Constitution* with the *Eudemian Ethics*, and throws in the little pseudo-Aristotelian tract on the *Virtues and Vices*. The first of these works presents a pretty straightforward problem for an edition of this kind: the editor has to do little more than provide a satisfactory translation. But the *Eudemian Ethics*, in spite of the work that has been done on it, is

still a hard nut to crack. The text is obscure and corrupt, and makes large demands on the conscientious interpreter. Mr Rackham has in fact made a large number of small suggestions for the improvement of the text, which will no doubt play their part when a satisfactory critical text finally comes to be made. The translation, in this volume as in its predecessor, is not only scholarly, but also fluent and readable; and the volume as a whole will be a welcome addition to the library of Aristotelian students.

It is natural that there should be a fair number of queries that a critical reader wishes to raise. We content ourselves with a few, one general and the rest particular. The general query

concerns the translation of the *E.E.* We question the translator's wisdom in departing so widely from tradition in the rendering of central terms in the Aristotelian vocabulary: *ἀρετή* is *goodness* (not *virtue*), *ψυχή* is *spirit* (not *soul*), *φρόνησις* is *wisdom* (not *prudence*), *θυμός* is *passion*; etc. We submit that, except in special cases, for all such central terms, which are defined by Aristotle himself, the conventional and traditional equivalent is the best; and we note that in his translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* Mr Rackham himself kept close to the tradition. The particular queries are these:

(1) 1217b 22 *λογικῶς καὶ κενῶς* 'an expression of logic and a mere abstraction': I doubt whether *λογικῶς* is ever correctly translated 'logical' in Aristotle.

(2) 1218b 1 'for universality might be an attribute of even a small good': the point is surely that a good which is

κοινόν, common to all good things, is realized in a small good as much as a great.

(3) 1223b 5: The translation does not make it plain that *τούτων* refers to what precedes, *τῶνδε* to what follows; and the *γὰρ*, epexegetic of *τῶνδε*, should not be rendered 'for'.

(4) 1228a 20 *ὁμολογεῖται τοῖς φαινομένοις* 'is admitted by reason of observed facts': surely the obvious translation 'agrees with observation' is here correct; cf. *De Caelo* 306a 6 *μὴ ὁμολογούμενα τοῖς φαινομένοις*.

(5) 1234a 24: 'All these middle states . . . are not virtues' is intended to convey that none of them are virtues.

(6) I was pained to find that on p. 191 'Stocks' was said to maintain the lateness of the *Eudemian Ethics*. The intended reference is to the late Mr St. George Stock.

J. L. STOCKS.

University of Manchester.

A NEW VERSION OF LONGINUS ON THE SUBLIME.

Longinus on Elevation of Style, translated by T. G. TUCKER. Pp. 64. Melbourne: University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS is the most readable translation of 'Longinus' which has so far appeared. It is a neat and terse piece of English, so thoroughly intelligible that no one need complain of the absence of the Greek text. Indeed, it would seem that Dr. Tucker has had the needs of the Greekless reader chiefly in mind; for the introduction, though adequate, is brief (it expresses the hope, rather than the belief, that the author may be Cassius Longinus after all), the notes are devoted mostly to the bare explanation of names and quotations, and, except for the few places where Dr. Tucker notes his own ingenious emendations (cf. *C.R.* 1893 XII p. 24), little information is given as to the text used; further, 32, §§ 5, 6 are omitted without comment, and 39, § 4 undergoes considerable abbreviation (justified in a note). For the Greekless, then, this translation is to be most warmly recommended, for everywhere, though not 'commonplace,' Dr. Tucker's 'expres-

sions rub shoulders with the common man' (31, § 2). But the work is full of interest also for students of Greek. Dr. Tucker is an honest translator who goes straight to the point, and who will not tolerate ambiguity or wordiness. Consequently, every page abounds in forceful renderings, and in clear and confident interpretations of difficult Greek, which are as good as a commentary, though not so good as the commentary which Dr. Tucker (one hopes) may yet write. Since misprints are few and trivial (on p. 20 'greatmindedness' is corrected to 'Great-mindedness,' and both are printed), and since I have no space to discuss even the few points on which I should care to cavil at Dr. Tucker's judgment, I conclude with two samples of Dr. Tucker's manner: 10, § 3 (on Sappho's poem): 'Admirable is it not, the way in which she feels as if she had lost command of all her vital powers at once—of body, hearing, tongue, sight, and colour—and the contradictory way in which she is cold and hot, senseless and sane, conscious of fear and yet nearly dead, so that she appears to be in the grasp, not of one sensation, but

of a whole crowd of sensations.' 21, § 2: 'if you hamper passion with conjunctions and other additions, it loses its

strength, its momentum, its suggestion of being shot from a catapult.'

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

GREEK SHORTHAND MANUALS.

H. J. M. MILNE, B.A.: *Greek Shorthand Manuals* (Syllabary and Commentary). Pp. viii + 78; 9 collotype plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1934. Cloth, 4to. 42s.

THE material published in this volume consists firstly of fragments of six papyrus codices from Antinoë, belonging to the Egypt Exploration Society, and containing Commentary, or Syllabary, or both, together with *σημεία μονόβολα* (which the editor compares to modern phraseograms) and specimens of Latin alphabets; secondly, of two papyrus codices, of uncertain origin, and a group of waxed tablets in the British Museum. Much was already known about the Syllabary, the list of shorthand signs for vowels, diphthongs and syllables, and the principles on which it was based; but with the publication of *τὸ κομμεντάριον*, the foundations of which are the two badly written London papyri of the third or fourth century A.D., 2561 and 2562, new ground has been broken. The Commentary, in this version at least—others were extant, and a fragment of one, differing both in order of signs and in content, is published on p. 68 of this volume—consists of 810 signs: each 'sign' is composed of a 'main element'—part of a word, a word or a phrase (if a phrase, often a rhetorical *cliché*)—also represented by its shorthand equivalent¹: attached to each main element is a group of four words (an extra word is added at the hundreds and occasionally elsewhere: the tetrads could clearly be extended at will), and the shorthand equivalents of the final syllables of these words are grouped round the symbol of the main element (these latter equivalents are not reproduced in Mr. Milne's text); of these 810 signs the great majority are pre-

served intact. In regard to the tetrads, two points need emphasis. The first is that they are not connected in any way with the main element, and when learnt by heart, as the Commentary was, had to be held in the memory simply by the power of association; however, more often than not the words in a tetrad do stand in a definite relation to each other, e.g. 357 σπλάγχνα, έντερα, όσφύς, θνηπόλος, and not infrequently form sentences, sometimes of a gnomic character, e.g. 24 άρείστην ένεγκήν (ε.—είν) ψήφον κρίνε (incidentally, the sentence in 305 φαιδράν περιβάλλεται προφήτης συνδόνα provides a queer parallel to Matth. 27, 59), and the words in a tetrad are arranged in a rough vowel order. Secondly, a large proportion of words in the tetrads are of purely literary currency; indeed, words whose use is confined to practical life, such as *άλληλέγγυος* (719) or *πρωτοπραξία* (723), may almost be counted on the fingers of one hand. Many, if not the majority of them would not have been used in the ordinary affairs of life; sometimes whole lists of words are taken from the vocabularies of medicine, religion, philosophy (e.g. *μετριοπαθής*), war, science, mythology and geography (not that of Egypt). Otherwise, the chief sources appear to be the orators and the comic poets, particularly Aristophanes and Menander. (Mr. Milne's suggestion that the immediate sources of the Commentary were the word-lists current in schools seems very probable.) The number of rare words, e.g. *σκυβαλικτόν* in 450, *σκορακίζει* in 427, and of words known only from the lexica, e.g. *ικμασία*, *κοπία*, is considerable, while that of words or forms entirely new (though in the latter case one must remember that the scribe was very illiterate) is surprisingly high—to give a few examples, *ταχυναύτης*, *χειροβοθης* (*sic*), *φιλοσπεύδει* (*φειλοσπεντει* Pap.), *θανατοζημιούται*, *άγχιπαθής*. In fact, to learn the Commentary must have

¹ The main elements might be abbreviated; e.g., to quote one of Mr. Milne's examples, the first and last syllables only of the phrase *τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν* were represented in the symbol.

been a considerable feat (and it is hardly surprising to learn from P. Oxy. 724 that the whole course covered two years); what the practical use of it was when learnt (except in schools of literature and rhetoric) it is hard to see. This does not make it less interesting to us: the Commentary is in fact of wider interest than might appear at first sight, and Mr. Milne deserves the thanks not only of those interested in papyrology or shorthand for a very thorough and laborious piece of editing. One can only regret that the notes are

not a little fuller, and that the editor has not allowed himself a little more space in the introduction, particularly if he could have carried further his ingenious researches into the origins of the signs on p. 4.²

C. H. ROBERTS.

St. John's College, Oxford.

² The combined papyri provide us with a nearly complete text of the Commentary; and it happens that one of the gaps can be partially filled from an unpublished parchment fragment in the Bodleian to which Mr. E. Lobel has kindly drawn my attention.

AN ITALIAN COMMENTARY ON LUCILIUS.

NICOLA TERZAGHI: *Lucilio*. Pp. vi+449. Turin: L'Erma, 1934. Paper, L. 30.

SIGNOR TERZAGHI, known from his *Per la storia della Satira* (1932) as a specialist in this subject, follows up his edition of Lucilius (1934) with a large volume which is 'sostanzialmente il commento alla... edizione'. The first hundred pages make a very readable account of what is known of Lucilius' life, and of the political and literary situation in Rome at the time. They do not, however, furnish new results of any importance, and some cases of misjudgement remind the reader that he must not give full adhesion to the author's arguments too hastily¹. The impression, indeed, that conclusions are drawn from insufficient evidence, and that opposing evidence is not always taken account of, is to a great extent confirmed by the commentary, which follows the arrangement of fragments given in T.'s edition, starting, however, very appropriately from the earlier books, XXVI-XXX. The state of the

tradition, of course, does not allow much certainty in the reconstruction of the satires, as is clearly shown by the great difference between the results of the attempts made by Marx, Cichorius and Schmitt, none of which can be dismissed easily. Yet T.'s reconstructions are often in contradiction with what can be regarded as certain, and in general are not convincing. Thus, at the beginning of the first satire dealt with, XXVI, 1, we find Lucilius discussing financial matters with Polybios (!), who advises him to become a *publicanus* in Asia, instead of worrying over the 'bad outcome of the *decumae* from his possessions. Unfortunately, the words attributed to Polybios by T., *hunc laborem sumas, laudem qui tibi ac fructum ferat*, are not only in themselves not very well suited for the purpose, but are actually shown by the way they are echoed in Horace (*Serm.* 2, 1, 10 ff.) to refer to the taking up of another sort of poetry. After this, the conversation switches over to a criticism of L.'s satiric poetry, a transition of which the difficulty is by no means lessened by T.'s 'si entra nel vivo del dialogo'. After defending himself, L. enters into a criticism not only of tragic but also (this is new and not convincing) of epic poetry. I am at a loss to understand why 633 f. should have anything to do with an epic description of a siege. There are a number of striking misinterpretations (e.g. 628), and the slightly bantering tone of 612 *veterem historiam inductus studio scribis ad amores tuos*

¹ I select a few samples of various kinds: (Pp. 29 ff.) Porcius Licinus, speaking of *Africani vocem divinam*, to which Terence listened *avidis auribus*, was not actually thinking of Scipio, but mixed him up with C. Gracchus, who really possessed a marvellous voice. (Pp. 51 and 60) Well-defined quantity did not exist in Latin (up to Stilo's time), and Ennius' and Accius' orthographical innovations served the purpose 'a far comprendere e sentire la quantità sillabica a tutti'.—The suggestion (p. 71, 12) on a fragment of Atilius disregards the rules governing the presentation of typical characters in ancient comedy.

(although T. is right in denying with Cichorius any obscene allusion) suffices to explode the whole theory of Polybios as interlocutor.

The space available for this notice does not allow the reviewer to go into further details. He would like to say

that T.'s 'Ho laborato onestamente' is beyond doubt, but that a few suggestions which may prove valuable are buried under a vast amount of ideas that are either unconvincing or wrong.

O. SKUTSCH.

St. Andrews.

VIANELLO'S JUVENAL.

D. Iunii Iuvenalis satirae: recensuit Natalis Vianello (corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum). Pp. lxxix + 227. Turin: Paravia, 1935. Stiff paper, lire 21.

THIS book must have cost its author considerable pains, but he has not spent quite enough of them upon thought and accuracy.

In the first satire the reports 16 *Sullae dedimus* Paris. 8072, 70 *rubeta* Paris. 8072, 86 *farrago* l.e. Fl. Sang., 108 *reductas* A, 131 *meiere* Paris. 8072, *mingere* L, 145 *it* GOT are false; which is the less excusable because he has made no original collations and his task was only to repeat correctly the statements of others. The apparatus, though he says on p. lxx 'curaui ne . . . superuacuis lectionibus laboraret', is loaded with such lections, 5, 11, 18, 19, 21, 51, 95-6, 102, 117, 119, 125, 133, 156, 160, 168: variants intrinsically insignificant, like *Thelephus* for *Telephus*, or offered only by insignificant MSS. At 85 *quidquid* he says 'quicquid O': if this is true, it is beneath mention; but he has in fact no means of knowing the reading of O, and is heedlessly copying Hosius, whose O is a sign with a different meaning; and at 134 'caules O' he repeats the mistake. He professes to give the readings of F at 99, 110, 119, 159: F does not contain this satire; he has again rambled off into a notation not his own. He will not use, as others do, a compendious designation for the mass of vulgar MSS: he prefers to enumerate some half-dozen of them, not sticking to the same, nor picking out the best, nor confining himself to those about which he really possesses information. P¹, which was Leo's sign for the first hand of P, is chosen by Mr Vianello to signify the second.

I have made no search for faults in

the other satires, but so many have caught my eye that the total must be very great, and some are very grave. The note at VI 614 on p. 92 is an assemblage of almost all imaginable blunders. That at III 109, though so chaotic that it must bewilder everybody, is so incredible that it can deceive nobody. Lack of skill and circumspection has disordered the notes on VII 96, VIII 7, X 359, XIII 4, 179, and at XV 75 his clumsiness has betrayed him into a false statement. In VIII he says that the vulgar MSS have *nasumque* for *nasoque* at 5 when the fact is that they have *nasumque* for *umerosque* at 4, and he neither records that 7 is given by the chief MS nor mentions its reading. At VI 65 he attributes four different readings to O and two to P. Neither in prosody nor in syntax is he much at home: he mentions the conjecture *conclilia*, says that *Psēās* is *Ψηκās*, and imputes *quodcumquē* to Buecheler; he cites *Ouid met.* VI 312 *lacrimas manant* as parallel to *animas caluerunt* at I 83, and X 46 *defossa in loculos* as parallel to IV 128 *erectas in terga sudes*.

The notes extend beyond the limits of an app. crit. and contain much matter taken from others, with or without acknowledgement. He sometimes falsifies quotations by unmannerly alteration, as when at VII 169 f, where I wrote 'ingrati reus est', he inserts 'animi', being ignorant of the technical term. Of his conjectures some are unprovoked and some violent; the best have no positive merit or claim to preference (for what he says of *laesi irae* X 313 is not true), and the worst (as III 42 and VI 511) are terrible. VI 64-6 he reduces to incoherency and shows that he has no conception of what is meant. Indeed, speaking generally, he does not think enough. Here are two

straws to show how the wind blows: VI 57 '*concedo et in agro castam fuisse* Σ unde Leo: <ego> cedo'; XIV 71 '*ciuis* Housm. cl. Σ *ciuem bonum*'. It would surprise him to learn that these are calumnies: the bad logic which he imputes to Leo and me is not shocking to him and does not even penetrate his consciousness. It follows that he does not always argue well, and is apt to miss the point on which he ought to

be disputing. Nor is he precise in the use of words. He applies the term 'glossa' to *firma* I 115, *pauperes* 119, *scutum et gladium* VIII 123, which, whatever they may be, are neither glossae nor glossemata. On p. XII he employs 'fortuna' as an abusive substitute for both cause and motive, and thereby vitiates his argument.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE LOEB EDITION OF CELSUS.

Celsus. De Medicina. With an English translation by W. G. SPENCER. In two volumes. I. [Books I-IV.] Pp. xiv+499. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

MR. SPENCER acknowledges generous permission to use Marx's text, but in fact not only has he made over a hundred alterations of spelling—mostly incomprehensible, as at II. 23 *oryza* and 24 *oriza*, where the manuscript authority is the same—and introduced thirteen misprints in exchange for the correction of three in Marx, but he has also adopted nineteen different readings. It is unpardonable that at all but four of these the reader is given no warning. One or perhaps two are improvements; several, as II. 6. 12 *liquida*, 7. 22 *aliqua ex parte*, 7. 33 the deletion of *aut circa tricesimum*, 14. 11 the retention of *ut* so that the sentence has no construction, 17. 9 *similitudine*, are scarcely credible. Of necessary changes like *qui corporum suorum robora* <inre> *quieta cogitatione nocturnaque uigilia minuerant* at pr. 7 nothing is said, so that Mr. Spencer's text, instead of marking an advance on Marx's, is inferior to it.

The translation is serviceable. In about a dozen places Mr. Spencer omits words, in five or six he renders a different text, and in about fifteen he

makes mistakes, as at pr. 41 where *haec* does not refer to *corpora*, II. 18. 11 *numquam generis alterius dari debet* 'neither of the two ought to be given,' 23 *oryza* 'rue,' III. 6. 7 *subumidi* 'less moist than usual.' His style is not always as neat as the Latin, and he allows himself to write sentences like 'the groins are to be scarified and cupped, repeating this every thirtieth day.'

The notes contain some useful observations but also things like 'from πύλον, a gate,' 'ἡπατικὸς νοῦσος,' 'καρδιακὸς νοῦσος,' 'Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* I. 364,' and 'Darenberg' (four times). Eleven of the textual notes need correction. The whole book is crowded with nearly eighty misprints.

In the bibliography, which is extremely short but long enough to contain three or four mistakes, it is unpleasant to find that the only work on Celsus published since Marx's edition which Mr. Spencer sees fit to mention is his own negligible paper in *Proc. Roy. Soc. Med.* XIX, 1926, Sect. Hist. of Med., pp. 129-139. When in the introduction Mr. W. H. S. Jones says 'Wellmann supposes that Celsus translated a Greek treatise written by his friend Cassius,' he ignores his paper in *Arch. f. Gesch. d. Med.* XVI, 1925, pp. 208 sqq.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

University of Liverpool.

LATIN VERSE INSCRIPTIONS.

ALBERT B. PURDIE: *Latin Verse Inscriptions.* Pp. 203. London: Christophers, 1935. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

THE Latin texts in verse that have come down to us inscribed on stone or

bronze, though seldom inspiring as literature, are a fruitful source of information about language, spelling and metre: and it is a fascinating pursuit to trace in them changes of literary

fashion and of funerary convention—new gods and new formulae. But the supreme importance of the inscriptions is what they tell us of the life and thought of the classes that have not spoken for themselves in literature. The great ones of earth recede: we hear the voice of Amemone, who kept a hostel at Tivoli '[quam propter mul]ti Tibur celebrare solebant,' of the artful freedwoman Allia Potestas, balanced between, or rather supported by, two lovers, of doctors, mimes and conjurers, of infant prodigies and weary centenarians.

Dr. Purdie's book is not a collection of inscriptions with a commentary. He has chosen instead to classify the material under three heads, Epitaphs, Sacred Verse Inscriptions, and General, and to discuss various topics in order, with copious illustration from the inscriptions, most but not all of which are quoted in full. This book provides a valuable repertorium both for the student at school or university and for the enlightened reader whose interest in the ancient tongues has not lapsed with the lifting of pedagogic sanctions.

The first class, that of epitaphs, is the largest and the most interesting. As might be expected, they deal mostly with the past life of the deceased and with the feelings of the living; there is less care of the future. Indeed, even when there is some expression of hope or indifference about a future state, it

is well to recall that the inscriptions are conventional in form, though they differ as much as do the vague aspirations of the 'Higher Thinker' and the robust acceptance of death enshrined in verses like—

Dum vixi, vixi quomodo condecet ingenuum.
Quod comedi et ebibi, tantum meu est.

The purely religious inscriptions contain comparatively little that is novel or valuable for the student: but Dr. Purdie deserves commendation for printing two remarkable poems, an African hymn to Juno as *Virgo Caelestis* and the elegant syncretistic poem from Tivoli:

Salve, sancte pater Priape rerum, etc.

Section III comes off poorly. There are few poems of historic interest. Dr. Purdie might have included the elegiac inscription from Corinth recording the campaign of Antonius against the pirates, for he is aware of its existence. Pompeii is not omitted, but hardly receives its due (pp. 180-4). Dr. Purdie observes that 'a large proportion, as we have hinted before, are mere obscenities on the part of vulgar amorists and we need not notice them.' But it would be ungracious to complain of this, for Dr. Purdie has provided such a varied and tasteful selection of poems that are aesthetically as well as ethically above Pompeii.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

THE ANCIENT WORLD.

T. R. GLOVER: *The Ancient World*. Pp. xi+388; 8 plates, 12 figs. in text, 6 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

DR GLOVER'S purpose is 'to enlist recruits' for the study not only of Ancient History but of History—for he writes in the spirit of Freeman's saying that all History is one, and indeed modern: the 'modern world,' he says, might be dated as beginning in 'the year when the first Greek wrote a book.' But there is another dictum of Freeman's which, for his present purpose, he rejects, namely that 'History is past politics and politics is present History': he has 'ignored politicians' and said

little of constitutions (but a good deal of laws), much of geography, of individuals, and of ideas. The result is 'not a text-book for any known examination.' It is evident, from his choice of modern instances, that he hopes to find many of his recruits beyond the Atlantic; but both to them and to those of the Old World he propounds more questions than he gives answers. His method is Herodotean, but with a recurrent reference to Polybius. The only general criticism I should venture is that the lack of a solid framework or scaffolding of politics may leave the structure of knowledge in the young reader's mind rambling and a little

insecure, unless he takes his 'recruitment' seriously and uses the book only as a stimulus and a starting-place. Rightly used, it will be more valuable than any text-book; misused, it may do more harm than good, but that will not be the author's fault.

Of comment in detail little can be offered here. Dr Glover's choice of matters to be emphasized and of what to omit or pass lightly over is, needless to say, highly individual. The pleasant effect of easy, rambling conversation half conceals the wealth of knowledge held constantly at command for illustration and suggestion: the obvious and familiar things are there—Pericles and *παίδευσίς τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, Xenophon and *θάλαττα, θάλαττα*, Cineas and *βασιλέων πολλῶν συνέδριον*—but how much more that is neither familiar nor obvious and that cannot fail to whet the appetite. Caesar is, of course, credited with founding the Empire—on ideas inspired

by 'the great open spaces' of the Gallic War. Cicero is kindly and justly handled. Antony 'belongs to literature far more than to history'—which may mean much, or not. The pages on the origins and the Founder of Christianity read rather like a sermon—but a first-rate sermon. A few small slips have been noted: Zama is dated two years too soon (p. 376), the Gabinian and Manilian laws each a year too late (p. 312); and with Melos and Scione and Samos in mind, it seems rather generous to say that 'while Athens ruled, there was to be no revolution in the streets of a little town and the victims carried out next day packed criss-cross on carts' (p. 149). But these are little things. Dr Glover has accomplished his purpose and done a good service to his subject.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION.

European Civilization, its Origin and Development: by various contributors, under the direction of EDWARD EYRE. In 7 volumes. Vol. i (reissue): Prehistoric Man and Earliest Known Societies. Pp. vi+844; 19 maps. Vol. ii: Rome and Christendom. Pp. 696; 9 maps, 14 diagrams. London: Milford, 1935. Cloth, 25s. and 15s.

THE only parts of these volumes that fall strictly within the scope of the *Classical Review* (or at all within the competence of the present reviewer) are those dealing with classical Greece in the first and with classical Rome in the second. Beyond these, no more than mention can be made of Professor Wilhelm Schmidt's chapters on Primitive Man (mainly a polemic against 'evolutionary preconceptions' and an enunciation of the doctrine of the 'real spirituality' and the innate monotheism of *homo sapiens*); of Professor Myres on the ethnology and early cultures of the Mediterranean and the Near East and on the Indo-Europeans; of Mr. T. E. Peet on Egypt; of Mr. R. E. M. Wheeler on the Celts; and of M. Charles Jean on the East. M. Jean's chapters,

indeed—rather rambling in structure, and not too happy in their English translation—show some inconformities with the other sections, where they traverse the same ground in the story of Egypt or Greece; and in the latter instance (however it be in the former) they suggest the question whether an editor ought to refrain from correcting statements which are not only inaccurate but inconsistent with others made elsewhere in the volume: for instance (to quote at random), that there were six Athenian *στρατηγοί*, or that Salamis was fought at the end of October, or Himera in the same year as Plataea, or that Demosthenes joined his voice to that of Isocrates in summoning Macedon to lead a crusade against Persia, or that Sparta took part with Thebes and Athens in the final struggle against Philip. The co-ordination and unification of historical views which is the avowed purpose of the series is not advanced by such avoidable discrepancies, nor is the reader's confidence in the writer strengthened.

Mr. A. W. Gomme writes on Greece and on Republican Rome, with an engaging brightness and lightness of

touch and a comprehensive range of interest that remind one of Mr. Glover (as in *The Ancient World*). Greece is excellently done, especially perhaps the fourth century and the early third. The Roman Republic is in general good, but seriously and surprisingly marred by inaccuracy of detail in the most familiar part of the story, the last century. Apart from matters of opinion—as that Marius was ‘the first soldier of genius’ produced by Rome (‘genius’ seems too good for him, and what about Scipio?)—it is not the fact (to cite a few instances) that freedman voters from 169 B.C. were ‘all enrolled in a single city tribe’ (see Livy xlv, 15); that Metellus Numidicus ‘made peace with Jugurtha because he was jealous of Marius’ (see Sallust, *Jug.* 83—an unsuccessful attempt to detach Bocchus from the enemy, but no treaty); that Sulla ‘could not enter Rome’ till after the battle of the Colline Gate (he had entered it, unopposed, after the battle of Sacriportus some eight months earlier); that Caesar was appointed governor of Cisalpine Gaul and *Noricum* (Illyricum) or Crassus of *Asia* (Syria); that one of the tribes was renamed Julia in honour of Caesar (like the Athenian compliments to Antigonids or Ptolemies), or that the title *Imperator* assumed by him was given ‘for life and to his descendants’ (see *C.A.H.* ix, p. 728); that Antony went straight to Cleopatra in Egypt after the treaty of Brundisium (he did not see her at all between the spring of 41 B.C. and the autumn of 37, and never returned to Egypt till after his Parthian campaign, in the autumn or winter of 36). Such statements as these may not seriously falsify the reader’s general

views of history; but when details—whether important or not—are given in a volume with this imprint, he is entitled to have them given correctly.

Mr. S. N. Miller on the Empire uses a different method, with much more discussion of principles and institutions, and much less narrative. His statements of fact seem invariably well founded (though one might note as controversial some points of financial administration, such as the relation between *fiscus* and *patrimonium*, or the scope of the *idios logos* in Egypt); the discussions seem in some places unnecessarily laboured and repetitive, e.g. on the conflict between republican and autocratic principles, and might with advantage have been shortened to make room for some fuller account—not less really important for history, and perhaps more desired by those who will consult these volumes—of the events of the period, such as the conquest of Britain (Agricola is barely mentioned, Plautius and the Claudian conquest are hardly even referred to). With Dr. W. E. Brown’s account of Christianity to the Edict of Milan, and Mr. Miller’s of the Church, the Later Empire and the Barbarians (to about the end of the fourth century) the reviewer hardly feels competent to deal: the former is mainly concerned with the doctrinal development, the latter with the working out of the alliance between Empire and Church. A special word of commendation must be given to the admirable maps, most of them produced by the skill of Mrs. Gomme.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

A HISTORY OF DELOS.

W. A. LAIDLAW: *A History of Delos*. Pp. 308. Oxford: Blackwell, 1933. Cloth, 18s.

APOLOGIES are due from the reviewer, who is alone to blame, to the author for the delay in the appearance of this notice.

Mr. Laidlaw has written a valuable account of Delos, which, though on somewhat different lines, will be a useful companion to Gardiner’s *Olympia*

and Poulsen’s *Delphi*. The present work is, as it professes to be, a history of the island, the account of the town and its monuments being confined to a single chapter, in which indeed the writer shows considerable skill in compression, the account, e.g., of Delian domestic architecture being an admirable summary. For the rest, the history of Delos falls into well-defined periods, which the author follows.

After an initial account of Delian legend there follow chapters on the island under Athenian control, Free Delos (with a good account of local administration), and the island restored under the Romans to Athens. It was at this time that Delos attained to its greatest importance as a trading centre, and the writer clearly brings out the motives of the Roman government in making it so. Most readers will turn at once to the chapter on *Italian and other Nationals*, in which the writer points out that the corporate life of the island was 'based on religious conditions and commercial interests subtly mingled.'

In a work of this kind, which deals with a mass of often highly controversial material, minor inaccuracies are inevitable. It is no doubt by a slip that on p. 63 the Pentakosiomedimnoi are called the second class of the

Athenians. M'. Aquillius was not the Roman governor of Asia (p. 259). The writer scarcely emphasizes sufficiently the motives of Pisistratus and Polycrates in connection with Delos. To would-be thalassocrats of this type control of the island-sanctuary was an initial step in securing control of the Cyclades, at which both were aiming. In later years both Ptolemaic and Antigonid policy was conditioned by similar considerations. The demand of the Athenians in 166 B.C. was the more readily granted by the Romans, as they had nothing to fear from Athens, and in restoring the island to her could deliver a serious blow to Rhodian standing and commerce.

These, however, are minor blemishes and detract little from the value of the book as a whole.

H. A. ORMEROD.

University of Liverpool.

THE ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY.

Professor R. J. BONNER: *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*. Pp. 199. (Sather Classical Lectures, Volume 11.) Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1933. Cloth, \$2.25.

WE have here eight lectures: The Sovereign People, The Judiciary, The Politicians, Freedom of Speech, Citizenship, Literature, Religion, Imperialism. For the original purpose of lecturing this arrangement was probably successful, but it has produced a somewhat formless and repetitive book. There are some perversely inaccessible notes which, when found at last, yield only references: there is no discussion or defence of even the most alarming statements of the text. The index is incomplete and suffers, as does the text, from the frequent use of English and American technical terms.

The general reader will find here an agreeable survey of Athenian life; and the beginner in classical studies may learn much—if he will exercise a vigilant scepticism. Many traps are set for his feet. Not *ὕψωσις* (p. 12), but *ἐξωμοσία*. The Athenians did not (and do not) nod to say 'no' (p. 21). The

silly story about *δικαστικός μισθός* ('Ath. Pol. 27) should really not be swallowed (pp. 37, 57): what the colonel said in his club is not evidence. 'Pericles was general for fifteen years' (p. 54): but that is not what Plutarch says. Thucydides, it seems, was ostracized in 443 (p. 144) and in 442 (pp. 58, 126); Hyperbolus in 418 (p. 58) and in 417 (a necessary inference from p. 62). Did Mytilene revolt in 429 (p. 95)? *ἀχρεῖος*, not *ἀπράγμων*, is the word of reproach in Thuc. II 40 (p. 102). On p. 117 there is an horripilant confusion of the rhetorical influences upon Xenophon's style and that gift of oratory without which, as Grote said, 'there would have existed no engine for kindling and sustaining the *sensus communis* of the Ten Thousand.' Do Cleon's speeches in Thucydides show that Cleon had 'learned rhetoric to some purpose' (p. 154)?

These are corrigible errors. It is a more serious matter that a book about Athenian democracy, even though primarily 'classical,' should be wholly empty of political interest. There is no space here to demonstrate this emptiness at length; but it may seem

surprising, for example, that a countryman of Mr. Walter Lippmann should have so little to say of the formation and control of public opinion in Athens, and sad that anyone should write of the *βουλή* that it was 'an efficient governing body,' and that in it 'men with qualities of leadership found a place'

(p. 19). Until classical study is yoked to modern political study it is *ἐτερόζη*—and Greek history will remain as, with rare exceptions, it has always been, an unearthly ballet of bloodless merry-andrews.

D. C. MACGREGOR.

Balliol College, Oxford.

PHILIP OF MACEDON.

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: *Filippo il Macedone*. Saggio sulla storia greca del IV secolo a. C. Pp. xvi+210. Florence: le Monnier, 1934. Paper, L. 30.

AN up-to-date study of the great Philip was badly needed, and Momigliano's book is most welcome. It is a masterpiece. We find in it a full and critical study of the evidence bearing upon the subject of Philip's rise to power in Macedonia and in Greece, together with a judicious discussion of all the recent literature; not forgetting the best of the older literature, from Grote and Droysen to Foucart and Schäfer. But M. also gives us, and this is the greatest of his many merits, a closely-argued synthesis of the main movements of Greek history from the Persian Wars to the Theban domination, and a most stimulating discussion of the political tendencies of Philip's own time. The book abounds in vivid and pregnant phrases; M. has the true historian's imagination.

The gradual growth of Philip's schemes, and their adaptation to the changing circumstances in each stage of his career, are notably well considered. M. stresses the continuity of policy whereby Philip aimed always at incorporating each newly-won district in the body of his growing Imperial State: at the beginning of his reign, Philip induced the princes of Upper Macedonia to join his court and share in his enterprises; the same policy brings in Thessaly and Chalcidice, about 350 B.C., as organic parts of his kingdom; and in the time after the Peace of Philocrates, Philip, having entered Central Greece as the champion of Delphi, makes his great effort to gain the good will of the Greeks and to be

accepted as their overlord—avoiding the use of brute force until the success of Demosthenes' propaganda made all other methods impossible. M. is perfectly fair to Philip's Greek opponents, at the same time insisting, with the most careful analysis, that they could never succeed in escaping that perennial dilemma of Greek politics, the mutual contradiction of Autonomy and Hegemony. In his concluding chapter on the Greek theorists of Panhellenism (Isocrates and others), M. shows that they, too, failed in this same respect; Isocrates, indeed, never quite saw the difficulty.

On almost every page M. gives us something important to consider—a fresh view, a suggestive criticism, a new analysis. From so rich a store, we can select only a few instances.

In the brilliant opening chapter, on Philip's predecessors, we find, amongst other good things, a revaluation of the fifth-century Alexander, to whom M. assigns (p. 8) the creation of the first hoplite army in Macedonia, the *πεζέταιροι* (Anaximenes, fr. 4 Jacoby),—and of Archelaus, who is left with his new roads and fortresses (Thuc. II. 100), but stripped of the various reforms gratuitously attributed to him by modern writers: M. finds that his careful and unambitious policy secured indeed the independence of Macedon, but left it weak and torn by faction (pp. 24 ff.). Incidentally, M. uses the evidence of coin-standards with great acuteness (e.g. pp. 27, 48)—though he fails to notice that Philip's gold standard is not only that of Athens but also that of the Daric (p. 49).

Philip's military reforms (p. 44) consisted, above all, in M.'s view, in the introduction of combined cavalry and

infantry tactics, and in the tactical distinction of the two wings, one offensive and the other defensive. Since both come from Thebes (the former first used by Pelopidas at Cynoscephalae in 364), M. insists that they were due to Philip himself, and not to Parmenio. Among the *ἐταῖροι*, M. distinguishes (p. 136, partly following Berve) the old household cavalry from Philip's *new ἐταῖροι*, including many Thessalians and Chalcidians: the former, some 1,800 in number at the beginning of Philip's reign (Diod. XVI. 35. 4), were most of them left behind when Alexander crossed to Asia; and when Theopompus (fr. 225b) states in his 49th book—i.e. about 340 B.C.—that the *ἐταῖροι* number only 800, he must mean the latter only. By 334 they must have nearly doubled in numbers, since the total was then over 3,200 (Diod. XVI. 17).

The jealous particularism of the Greek states, one of the most amazing phenomena in history, is signally illustrated in the case of the Phocians: they depended absolutely upon Athens and Sparta for help against Philip, yet in 348 Phalaecus returned to power *just because* his opponents were arranging to allow Athens and Sparta to continue to garrison Thermopylae (p. 116; compare also the Phocians' aid to the revolt of Euboea against Athens a little

before, p. 111; M. accepts Parke's version, *J.H.S.* 1929, of this campaign).

The series of M.'s acute and interesting observations could be continued indefinitely. It must suffice to refer to his handling of the relations of Philip (and of Athens) to Persia (pp. 138, 150 ff.), of the League of Corinth (161 ff.), of the Peloponnesian situation in the critical years 343-2 (p. 145).

A topic, here treated for the first time, and of great general interest, is that of the worship of Philip (pp. 173 ff.). M. clearly shows that divine honours were paid him at Amphipolis, and even at Athens, and that there was a *ἱερὸν* of his father Amyntas at Pydna; but will many scholars agree that the custom was Macedonian and not purely Greek in origin?

There are a few other points on which M. is not altogether convincing, e.g. that the peace of 346 came long before Philip could have expected it; and one could have wished that the Persian history, during Philip's reign, had been dealt with more fully—Mentor is not once referred to! But M. has produced a very fine book, and one that will always remain among the greatest contributions of modern times to the criticism and understanding of ancient history.

M. HOLROYD.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

SENATE AND PROVINCES AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC.

J. MACDONALD COBBAN: *Senate and Provinces*, 78-49 B.C. Some aspects of the foreign policy and provincial relations of the Senate during the closing years of the Republic. Pp. xii+218. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THIS book is the Thirlwall Prize Essay for 1935. The first three chapters are, respectively, on the Senate in this period, on its foreign policy, and on the appointment of the provincial governor and the creation of extraordinary commands. Then comes a study of Lucullus, as the great commander and administrator who was entirely loyal to the senatorial system, and whose 'downfall symbolized and foreshadowed the down-

fall of the Senate.' A chapter on the administration of the provinces ('largely supplementary' to Arnold's work) is followed by a review of 'Roman rule in practice.'

Throughout the book runs the idea that senatorial government of the Empire was better at this time than is usually allowed. One may agree that there was probably much more ability and goodwill among eminent conservatives in the Senate than some modern histories would lead one to suppose; that provincial governors may often have been capable and well-meaning; and that there were good features in the system itself. But the author holds that 'it is incorrect to speak of the

"failure" of the senatorial administration of the provinces, for it continued as a vigorous and on the whole efficient system as long as the Senate maintained its power at Rome.' Yet it hardly seems that in these years the provinces were on the whole the better administered the stronger the Senate was. Given the temper of the age, could senatorial government of the provinces ever be strong enough to be in the main a 'success'? Did not the very idea of the senatorial system—the idea that the Senate alone, without a really effective central *imperium*, should exercise supreme control over policy and administration—mean that the central government was constitutionally far too weak to prevent a scramble among Roman citizens (senators included) for the profits and opportunities of empire from causing an immense amount of misery among provincials, while dragging the Roman people towards civil war?

The essay seems on the whole a careful piece of work, which might give some help to university students. There are some slips in the reading of ancient authorities, some interpretations of the evidence which seem rather strained, and now and then, perhaps, a misunderstanding of general conditions. A few points of detail may be noticed. The statement on p. 44, that the *Lex Gabinia* 'received considerable support in the

Senate,' seems, from a passage on p. 126, to be based on Cicero's mention of a few distinguished senators as supporting the *Lex Manilia* (*De Imp. Pomp.*, 23, 68). On p. 58 'Crassus' Eastern Expedition' is said to have been 'grudgingly countenanced' because of the Senate's fear of Parthia. Was there any fear of Parthia at Rome before Carrhae? On pp. 53 and 179 the use of conscription in 55 is treated as exceptional. Is it not very unlikely that Roman armies were now as a rule raised wholly, or even mainly, by voluntary enlistment? For conscription in 58 there is evidence in *De Prov. Cons.*, 2, 5. As to reports from governors to the Senate (p. 150), the passage from *In Pisonem* (16, 38) quoted on p. 151, n. 5, suggests that a governor might well send no report on civil administration. That Clodius was able to make a *contio* believe that he had received a letter from Caesar (about Cato) does not show that official reports from governors were frequent (p. 151).

To adapt Cicero, Mr. Cobban's book *non modo L. Lucullum, fortissimum et clarissimum virum, verum etiam senatus Romani nomen illustrat*. It is easier to praise Lucullus than to defend the senatorial system. But the attempt to do both was worth making.

C. G. STONE.

Oxford.

THE AQUEDUCTS OF ANCIENT ROME.

THOMAS ASHBY: *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*. Edited by I. A. Richmond. Pp. xvi+342; portrait frontispiece, 24 half-tone plates, 34 figures, 7 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 63s.

THE greater part of this treatise consists of a description of the eleven main aqueducts. This is preceded by a survey of earlier topographical study, and chapters on the making and preservation of these works of utility, the staff of the imperial water board, Frontinus and his work, and the engineering of the aqueducts. Graphic material and index form essential elements of the whole.

The author died on 15th May 1931.

Si monumentum requiris, —. Thomas Ashby has sometimes been described as heir to the British tradition of outdoor archaeology exemplified in Gell, Leake, and Dennis. The description is inadequate, for there are 'diversities of gifts.' The ablest interpreter of the Roman Campagna was also a great collector of books and documents and an unwearying archival investigator: these varied interests are reflected in the volume now before us. No predictable circumstances can rob it of its pre-eminence as a statement of what is known regarding those characteristic products of the Romans, respect for which inspired Diocletian and Maximian

to commemorate their own efforts at maintenance by a dedication (*C.I.L. VI. 773 = I.L.S. 626*) *Tiberino patri aquarum omnium et repertoribus admirabilium fabricarum priscis viris honori*.

Ashby was fortunate in that the lifelong interest which led to his culminating scientific achievement was one peculiarly adapted to his talents; and that length of years and freedom of opportunity were granted him in sufficient measure for the accomplishment of the main part of his task. The collaboration which he required, and for which he appealed with confidence in the fairness of his request, was freely given him: the data prepared by the heads of the Italian school of engineering; the designs by F. G. Newton; the expert dating of the ruins by Dr. E. B. Van Deman, on the basis of her unrivalled knowledge of Roman construction. He lived to complete, in all essentials, his topographical description with its wealth of archival documentation, to prepare parts of the Introduction and to outline the rest. The chapters on Frontinus and on the engineering of the aqueducts were reserved by him for the last; if he had been spared he would have executed these too with his invariable thoroughness, but his heart would always have been on the open Campagna and among the old books rather than in constructive historical scholarship. These two last-mentioned chapters, in the shape which they have assumed, are the brilliant contribution of his gifted pupil, to whose tact, learning and *pietas* the volume owes its definitive form; while Mrs. Ashby's foreword attests a devotion to the author and his ideals in a relationship still more intimate and sacred.

To the widely scattered survivors of those far-off Campagna days this book will recall vivid memories. We still see Ashby's aqueducts in a setting of perpetual light and verdure: for he had learnt to choose for his field-work the springtime, when—as he himself would say—'the afternoons are growing longer and the grass has not yet grown

too long.' For us, this volume will be a cherished possession. And while its pages may not exert the same appeal on others, still within its blue covers there will be handed on something of the rare qualities of mind and heart that we found in our friend. Apart from this, the book merits a position of honour in every library devoted to any one of a group of subjects not always intimately associated: Roman administrative history, the topography of Latium, the history and technique of hydraulic engineering, the progress of antiquarian pursuits in Italy from Renaissance times down to our own day.

Even in the present instance, it is a reviewer's privilege to add his modest *marginalia*. We resist the temptation to discuss some of the definitions in the Glossary; but we would strike out the spurious *Aqua* which has occasionally adhered to *Anio Vetus* and *A. Novus* (pp. xii, xiii, xv, 252 ff., 321); and, again in the interest of the name of the loftiest of the aqueducts, we would rectify the 'pie' at the end of p. ix. We would recast the allusion to Fabretti on p. vi in the light of the statement on pp. 2-3; and on p. 8 space might be found for a reference to the emergence in Rome a few years ago of a number of Parker's precious negatives, *not* destroyed by fire. On p. 28, n. 1, my review of the Loeb *Frontinus* should relinquish its place under Ashby's name. More important, on p. vi the statement that Ashby 'had envisaged this task before 1908' could be recast so as to state that the decade ending with that year saw the inception of the work and the great bulk of its earlier stages of execution: it was upon the sound foundations laid in those first years that the scientific edifice was constructed. But the scantiness and the secondary character of these suggestions are the best testimony to the care and competence with which this noble volume has been produced.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

American Academy in Rome.

Across the Centuries. By T. G. TUCKER.

Pp. 53. Melbourne: University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

Dr. TUCKER'S aim in publishing this volume of translations from the Greek classics was, as he explains in the preface, to disprove the idea that the ancient Greeks were too cold and austere for modern taste. Whether that belief is so common as he thinks is perhaps doubtful, but his selection is certainly well fitted to disprove it. It includes a number of short pieces from the lyric and elegiac poets, all interesting and attractive and translated in various metres. He even ventures, in translating Xenophanes, on the perils of English elegiacs, though with the aid of an occasional anacrusis, and even allows himself 'pentathi' as a trochee, hardly a happy invention. Then follow some passages from the Iliad, translated into trochaic verse. This metre seems to lack dignity, but that is deliberate, for in his preface Dr. Tucker strongly denies that either the verse or the matter of Homer was "noble," in any rational sense. For similar reasons no doubt he admits in his diction the language of prose in company with the conventional vocabulary of verse, rather disturbingly, as in the lines:

'Aye, by all means run away, if so thy heart
desires, for I
Beg not thou shouldst stay for my sake: I have
others at my call.'

The volume concludes with translations of the Funeral Oration of Pericles and the last scene of the *Phaedo*. Both are vigorous, but it is doubtful whether the short sentences adopted here, as by most modern translators of the Funeral Oration, can give the effect of that early Attic oratory which Thucydides certainly intended to convey. There is (p. 45) a puzzling note on the text of Thucydides II. c. 42, § 4, which may be due to a misprint.

F. R. EARP.

Queen Mary College, London.

ANTONIO GIUSTI: *Antologia Omerica (Odisea)*. Pp. 205. Milan: Signorelli, 1935. Paper, 5 lire.

THE companion volume to the same editor's Anthology of the Iliad noticed in C.R. XLIX. 4. An English reader may feel that undue space is given to explanation of elementary points of grammar and metre; but occasionally there are learned and interesting notes, e.g. at *Od.* iv. 49 (Washing), xv. 15 (The Suitors). The most valuable part of the book for a student of Homer is the index, which contains useful references to recent discussions, in English and foreign periodicals, of various subjects, including the topography of Ithaca and of Scheria, the meaning of *πλωτός* and *χθαυλός*, and parallels to the ruse of Odysseus in calling himself *Οδύσεος*. J. T. CHRISTIE.

Repton.

Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera recensuit C. WENDEL. Pp. xxviii + 402. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935. Paper, RM. 20 (bound, 22). Wendel has admirably completed the structure whose foundations were laid by Ludwig Deicke,

an early victim of the European war. Keil had regarded *L* as the source of all other forms of the scholia; to Deicke, who unearthed an 'Ambrosian' recension to stand beside the three known stocks, the four seemed independent of each other. But W., who published his conclusions in 1932, found *L* to be the basis of the Ambrosian abridgment and the chief contributor to the Parisian and Florentine corpora; for this last he agrees with H. Fraenkel that Lascaris used also a MS. akin to *G* and *S*, a pair whose scholia and glosses W. himself was the first to collate. Hence *L* is now his staple, with some help from its kinsmen *G* and *S*; its descendants *A*, *H*, and *F* (Lascaris) contribute selected conjectures; and 'Parisian' divergences from *L* are reported, even where they are counted inferior and perhaps conjectural.

The resultant text is much better than Keil's. Slight changes improve the scholiast's own expression, emend his quotations, or elucidate his comments on diction, etc. Of some 70 new lacunae, opened chiefly by W. himself, a third help thus or in verbal distinctions, a baker's dozen in geography, the rest in mythology; and some of Keil's disappear. Transpositions serve to remove absurdity from a legend, or, as do detachments also, to make a new scholium emerge; lemmata receive needed expansion or replacement; v. ll. are recognized as such, or added from MSS. Very full testimonia are given. M. T. SMILEY.

University College, London.

Aristotle: *Metaphysics*, Bks. x-xiv, with English translation by H. TREDENNICK, M.A.: *Oeconomica* and *Magna Moralia* with English translation by G. CYRIL ARMSTRONG, B.A. Pp. vi + 688. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s.

BESIDES the second part of the *Metaphysics*, the present volume contains the *Oeconomica* (Book 3, in the absence of any Greek text, in the literal Latin version of Durand) and *Magna Moralia*. Interest on the reader's part will be focussed on the *Metaphysics*; but the reviewer need only say that Mr. Tredennick's version continues to be excellent and almost faultless.

Mr. Armstrong has also on the whole done well. In translating the uncouth Latin he not unnaturally makes one or two slips. P. 402, *simul deliberet et oboediat, si ille praeceperit*: 'let her assist him in deliberation, and if he gives instructions, obey them,' not 'agreeing with him, obey his behest.' The wife is told to obey her husband *if* he gives orders, but is not altogether precluded from independent thought. P. 407, *hoc autem non obtinentes patientur defectum*: 'children deprived of these advantages will experience feelings of revolt from their parents,' not 'parents who observe not these precepts will be losers thereby.' (There was clearly a *μὲν* and *δὲ* in the Greek, and in any case *obtinere* cannot mean 'observe.') There are also errors of judgment in the translation from the Greek. P. 335, *ὡς περ οὐδὲ τὰ ἡθὴ δέαι ἀλαστονευομένους ἀλλήλοισι πηλοῖσιν*: 'it is not well that souls should approach one another in borrowed plumes':

the suggestion is grotesque, and 'souls' surely cannot represent τὰ ἡθῆ. P. 653, 'synonymous' is wrongly substituted for 'homonymous.' P. 463, τῆς γενέσεως must evidently be taken with αὐτῶν, not with τύχην. The translation 'Leech' for ἰατρός, and the pronominal He, Him in speaking of God, strangely misrepresent the spirit of the original.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

HANS STROHM: *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Meteorologie*. Pp. 84. (Philologus, Supplementband XXVIII, Heft 1.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 5.50.

THERE is a principle of logical arrangement in Aristotle's physical writings; the *Meteorologica*, coming last, recapitulates the results of the three preceding treatises, and seems intended to prepare for the transition to the study of organic life. The question is whether this sequence corresponds either to the order in which A. arrived at the doctrines or to the order in which he wrote the books. *A priori* it is more probable that the whole system went on growing from an original nucleus; and Mr. Strohm has tried to illustrate this thesis by a hitherto untried example. He finds in the *Meteorologica* a contrast between the speculative point of view, in which the cosmos is neatly parcelled out into οὐρανοὶ τόποι for the five simple bodies, and the humble attempt to give a causal explanation of visible and observed phenomena. The contrast depends on, and is chiefly illustrated by, a remarkable change in A.'s view of the element which he normally calls Fire, and situates at the circumference of the lower universe. In the second chapter of Bk. A (339a 36), he suddenly casts doubt on the distinction between Air and Fire; and after an aporetic discussion it emerges that in place of Fire we must assume a 'warm and dry exhalation, which is really an upper stratum of Air. This is kindled like fuel by the revolution of the spheres, and hence the stars give warmth and light. This view (which in fact was already assumed in certain details of the *de Caelo*) definitely supplants the more speculative one when we come down to details of 'meteorology.' From this starting-point Mr. Strohm conducts a careful but not always convincing analysis of the treatise in detail. What he never successfully shows is that A. might not have begun with an over-simplified scheme, which would then be removed like the scaffolding from a building.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

FERNAND BOULENGER: *Saint Basile aux Jeunes Gens*. Pp. xl + 74 (double). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1935. Paper.

IN the long history of the reactions of early Christianity to the pagan schools and to Greek Literature in particular, summarized by Boulenger in his Introduction, the treatise of Basil πρὸς τοὺς νέους ὅπως ἀν' ἐξ Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῦντο

λόγων (printed also in vol. IV. of the Loeb translation of Basil's letters) is one of the most interesting documents. The treatise has many echoes of the *Republic*, and Basil's opinion on the place of the Classics in the schools is essentially that of Plato, with modifications bringing it up to date: πάντων δὲ ἥκιστα περὶ θεῶν τι διαλεγόμενοι (τοῖς ποιηταῖς) προσέξομεν, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ὡς περὶ πολλῶν τε αὐτῶν διεξιῶσι καὶ τοῦτων οὐδ' ὁμοιοῦντων (IV. 19). Boulenger has examined 26 MSS in the Bibliothèque Nationale, but he knows of more than 50 other MSS scattered over Europe and frankly presents a provisional text. His text and translation are followed by nine pages of notes in which Basil's references and allusions to Greek and Sacred writers are traced to their source. A scholarly and most useful edition.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

HERMANN EBERHART: *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek*, IV. Literarische Stücke. (Schriften der Hessischen Hochschulen, Universität Giessen, Jahrgang 1935, Heft 2.) Pp. 35; 4 plates. Giessen: Kindt, 1935. Paper.

THE present publication contains all the hitherto unpublished literary papyri in the Giessen collection with one exception, fragments of the so-called Acta Alexandrinorum, the editing of which was practically completed by von Premerstein before his death, and which will appear as No. V of this series. The dozen items under review are mostly in a deplorably fragmentary state, but the editor has performed his task with exemplary fullness worthy of richer material. These are the contents in order: Extracts, perhaps alphabetic, from the Psalms, 4th cent.; Christian prayer, on vellum, 7th-8th cent.; Iliad i. 163-175, the first direct authority for ἐπεὶ in l. 168, 1st cent. B.C. (the plate suggests rather 1st cent. A.D.); Iliad vi. 162-177, 1st cent. B.C.; Od. vii. 111-124, 1st cent. B.C.; Dialogue on the Odyssey with participant called Theophanes, another copy of the same work as in P. Lit. Brit. Mus. 160, perhaps by Aristotle, 3rd cent. B.C.; Scholia quoting Hellanikos and Simonides, with numerous new contractions not in the similar Ath. Pol. papyrus, circ. 100 A.D.; Plot of a New Comedy?, 2nd cent.; Mythological fragment, 1st cent. B.C.; Metrical treatise, 2nd-1st cent. B.C.; Medical (coloboma operation), 2nd-1st cent. B.C.; Recipe, 1st cent. B.C. The early date of so many of the papyri makes us regret still more their extreme scrappiness.

H. J. M. MILNE.

British Museum.

GEORGE DEPUÉ HADZSITS: *Lucretius and his Influence*. Pp. viii + 372. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London etc.: Harrap, 1935. Cloth, 5s.

AS befits the editor of the series 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome,' Professor Hadzsits' main interest has been in the influence of Lucretius. In a series of chapters he traces it from Cicero

to D. H. Lawrence. With great ingenuity he has woven together transmission of the text, admiration and imitation of Lucretius the poet, and the shifting attitude to his philosophy into a single fascinating story, illustrated with a wealth of detailed learning. He rightly emphasizes the strange 'conspiracy of silence' among Lucretius' contemporaries and throughout the Empire, the fierce opposition of the Church, beginning with Lactantius, to the 'atheist,' and the gradual recognition, starting with the XVIIth-century scientists and the XVIIIth-century Deists, of his scientific value and of his general philosophic position. This task has never been so fully accomplished, and 'our debt' to Dr. Hadzsits is here very great.

The chapters in which Lucretius' views are expounded appear to me less satisfactory; an ecstatic admiration has led Dr. Hadzsits into exaggeration and occasionally into misstatement. Much might be said on this subject, but the most startling innovations occur in the chapter on Lucretius' religion. That Lucretius, while denying providence, believed in the existence of gods and held the possibility of communion with them by means of the *simulacra*, I should be the last to deny. But that he exalted this into a Gospel, a new religion to take the place of the old, I find it hard to believe; the only place where Lucretius even hints at it is the obscure passage in vi 68 ff. Nor can I accept the corollaries that 'it goes without saying that the Epicureans took over the old pantheon' (p. 114), and that 'worship and prayer were taken for granted' (p. 116). There is not space for me to argue these points fully, but I must protest against the translation, on which the second inference largely turns (p. 223), of v 1203, *sed mage pacata posse omnia mente tueri*, 'piety consists in cherishing (or "observing") these rites.' *Omnia tueri* means nothing but 'to look upon the world'; the phrase is exactly parallel to the *omnituentes sensus* of ii 942, and it cannot be taken to prove Lucretius' support of orthodox ritual any more than can the description of Cybele's worship in ii 600 ff., which Dr. Hadzsits also uses.

But if the book thus provokes quarrel here and elsewhere, that does not detract from the value of a very stimulating and interesting study.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

EMANUEL CESAREO: *De Statii duabus silvis*. Pp. 32. Naples: Istituto Meridionale di Cultura. 1935.

THE *duae silvae* of this pamphlet are *Silv.* IV. 7 and 8: the author regards them as akin to the *genre* of *carmen natalicium* and is concerned to point out their relations with the rhetorical precepts for a *λόγος γενεθλιακός* and with similar works by other poets. He devotes considerable space to recording 'imitations' of earlier poets by Statius which 'escaped' Vollmer: while he makes a few interesting points, many of his connexions are quite unpalatable—on IV. 8. 9 *sertis altaria* it is unnecessary to quote seven passages in which *serta* and *ara* are used in similar contexts by the elegists—

and his treatment is often extravagant. On IV. 8. 10 (*turba nepotum*, etc.) he says 'pleraque Statii vocabula obscura sine Tibullo sunt': comparing IV. 7 and the Fourth Eclogue he bursts out 'Utinam S. vestigiis illius auctoris institisset! Utinam ample pueri vitam atque futuras res gestas, Vergilii exemplar secutus, illustrasset!' The remarks on IV. 7. 52-6 show misunderstanding of *reddis*. The essay is filled out to inordinate length by repeated eulogies of Statius and almost every other poet who is mentioned, and the author's enthusiasm has blinded him to some doubtful Latinity.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

ROBERT S. ROGERS, KENNETH SCOTT, MARGARET M. WARD: *Caesaris Augusti Res Gestae et Fragmenta*. Pp. xii+119; 25 photographs, 16 coins drawn. Boston, U.S.A.: D. C. Heath (London: Harrap), 1935. Cloth, \$1.20.

THIS edition of the recorded writings and sayings of Augustus is an excellent attempt to meet the difficulty of supplementing Caesar for junior forms. The Monumentum Ancyranum admirably fulfils this purpose. The Latin is good, the sentences short, the words not very difficult, and the subject-matter interesting. The letters and fragments raise doubts; for their style is less simple and the matter not so well suited to juniors. In fact we should have preferred to see two books—a very cheap edition of the Monumentum for juniors, and a complete edition with full notes for seniors. But even in its present form this is a very attractive addition to school text-books, being generously illustrated with drawings of coins and well-chosen photographs, and including a vocabulary. The notes are a little disappointing. Grammatical points are not very clearly explained for beginners and the historical commentary might have been made more lively. The small boy will be disappointed that he is told so very little about Roman gambling games; and he may find the regulations governing the aqueduct of Venafrum difficult to follow even in English. But in the hands of the right master this book will prove an excellent companion to Roman history and Roman life; and, in spite of its elementary dressing, even senior forms should find it useful.

R. MEIGGS.

Keele College, Oxford.

Iustinus: *Epitome Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. Edidit OTTO SEEL. Pp. xvi+375. Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Paper, RM. 10 (bound, 11.20).

THE editor has done his work with reason and common-sense. Of his eighteen Mss, he has collated several, including C, himself. Regarding the family γ, he has argued (*Stud. Ital.* 1934) that D is a true member of this class and of importance where C fails (about half of Justin), but that C itself is much interpolated and was greatly overrated by Ruehl, who did not provide a full collation, but quoted it only where its reading has a specious look. An important feature therefore of this text is the

adoption of *r*'s reading in very many places where C has lately been preferred. There can be no doubt that if Seel's view is right—and it looks as if it is—the study of Justin has been definitely furthered. Seel is perhaps sometimes too conservative in restoring the reading of the Mss where editors, to save Justin from committing historical and geographical blunders, have emended the text. His own emendations, about ten in number, vary in merit, the most daring being *Sophitis* < *regnum* > 12, 8, 10; cf. Q. Curt. 9, 1, 24. He believes Justin's date to lie around 300 A.D., and scholars would be interested to hear his reasons. The volume closes with a text of the *Prologi* of Trogus and two indices verborum which, so far as I have tested them, are correct.

E. J. WOOD.

University College, Aberystwyth.

SISTER MARY EMILY KEENAN: *The Life and Times of St. Augustine as Revealed in His Letters*. Pp. xx+221. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. XLV.) Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1935. Paper, \$2.

THOSE who, like the present reviewer, have read through the Epistles of Augustine with pen in hand, find, when they have reached the end, that they have forgotten a good deal of the contents. The present volume will refresh their memories admirably. The author gives in fact a very thorough and detailed account of her subject. The classification of details is most minute, and covers everything except matters of 'doctrine, discipline, and ecclesiastical institutions,' everything in fact that is of interest to the classical scholar. There is an extensive bibliography, into which some inaccuracies have been allowed to creep, and there are three comprehensive indexes. Occasionally the vigour of the original suffers somewhat in translation (e.g. p. 6); on p. 136, n. 172, six words are accidentally omitted from the Latin citation: on p. 137, *Numidiorum* should be *Numidarum*; on p. 146, *fiscus* should be *viscus*. The work teems with interest, and should not be neglected by anyone who studies the life of the ancient world.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

JAKOB JAN DE JONG: *Apologetiek en Christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix*, with a summary in English. Pp. viii+132. Maastricht: Boosten en Stols, 1935. Paper. THIS is a very thorough piece of work, dealing with the doctrine of Minucius Felix, and illustrating, among many other things, his indebtedness to Cicero. On the vexed question of date, the author argues for the period 222-235 (Alexander Severus). That he is right in putting Minucius later than Tertullian should not, I think, be any longer open to doubt. What must now be decided is whether he is not also post-Cyprianic, or contemporary with Cyprian. The book is well worth the attention of all persons interested in the early stages of the development of Christian thought.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

N. VALMIN: (i) *Die Zeus-Stoa in der Agora von Athen*; pp. 7. (ii), (iii) *Rapport préliminaire de l'expédition en Messénie*, 1933, 1934; pp. 7, 51. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1933-34, I, II; 1934-35, I.) Lund: Gleerup.

ASSUMING as correct the generally accepted identification of the Stoa Basileios with the double portico whose foundations were excavated by the Americans in 1931, Mr. Valmin argues forcibly that the much-sought Stoa of Zeus or Stoa Eleutherios is the same structure under another name. Two other stoa, Peisianakteios-Poikile and Makra-Alphitopolis, are cited as examples of double nomenclature.

The Swedish excavations on the hill of Malthi have laid bare the remains of a considerable settlement which began in Early Helladic times, passed through a flourishing Middle Helladic period, and perished in a general conflagration at the end of the Mycenaean age. The transitions from Early to Middle and from Middle to Late Helladic were peaceful and gradual. The entire settlement was enclosed by a fortification wall of MH date; an inner wall encircled the summit of the acropolis, on which stood a group of buildings, doubtless the residence of the chief. These walls suggest an analogy, however remote, with the prehistoric settlement of Dimini and its series of ring-walls, the innermost of which encloses a megaron. Early Helladic influences however may well have persisted, and been the cause of a general resemblance in layout to the Cretan Late Minoan town of Gourniá, to which the excavator calls attention.

H. L. LORIMER.

Somerville College, Oxford.

KRISTER HANELL: *Die Inschriftensammlung des Konstantinos Laskaris*. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1934-1935, IV.) Pp. 10. Lund: Gleerup, 1935. Paper, 0.60 Sw. cr.

DR. HANELL here examines the copies of seventeen Greek inscriptions made by Constantine Lascaris in the fifteenth century and preserved in the Madrid Library. The collection was published by Iriarte in 1769, but has passed unnoticed by Greek epigraphists. The texts are all, with one possible exception, published in the *C.I.G.* or in *I.G.*, but Lascaris' copies contain supplements or corrections of some value, especially in the case of stones which have been lost or damaged. After examining each of the inscriptions in turn, the author discusses the relation between these copies and those made by Cyriac of Ancona, 'the great founder of epigraphy,' from whom this little collection may well be ultimately derived. It thus serves as a 'modest witness to the interest aroused by the investigations of the great Anconitan.' Dr. Hanell has done his work thoroughly, and we are grateful to him for the fresh light he has thrown on the influence of Cyriac and on the early history of the Greek epigraphical tradition.

M. N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

OSCAR LEUZE: *Die Satrapieneinteilung in Syrien und im Zweistromlande von 520-320.* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft; Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, 11. Jahr, Heft 4.) Pp. x+320 (=157-476 of the volume). Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer, 1935. Paper, RM. 20.

PROFESSOR LEUZE was unhappily prevented by death from completing his monograph; for it had been his intention to carry his investigation down to 300 B.C. and then to revise the whole. In the book as published he begins with a review of the scanty data for the administration of the 'Fertile Crescent' under Cyrus and Cambyse. Then, after a general discussion of Darius' satrapal reorganization throughout the Persian Empire, he examines minutely the evidence for the geographical boundaries and the varying number of satrapies in Mesopotamia and Syria in the time of Darius I, in 401, in 350, under Artaxerxes III and Darius III, and finally under Alexander the Great. The book contains many acute observations and a number of valuable passages. Such are the discussion of Herodotus' account (III, 89-97) of the Persian satrapies, which is at variance with the evidence from the inscriptions of Behistun, Persepolis, and Naksh-i-Rustam; the careful scrutiny of Xenophon, *Anabasis* VII, 8, 25-6; and the review of Alexander's appointments to administrative and military posts, which corrects Berve and others on a number of points. Though very cautious, Leuze was inclined to believe that Herodotus' list represents the organization of the Persian Empire not as it was under Darius I, but in the historian's own time, say, about 450 B.C. The passage at the end of the *Anabasis* he shows, as it seems conclusively, to be an interpolation and not by Xenophon. The monograph is also useful in demonstrating by numerous instances that Lehmann-Haupt's article *Satrap* in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie* is a very unsafe guide calling for sundry qualifications and not a few corrections.

Nevertheless, taken as a whole, the book offers little but negative results. The discussion and attempted refutation of other scholars' theories are carried on for page after page with wearisome reiteration, until the reader might be forgiven for exclaiming, 'If this be historical research, I will none of it.' Indeed, only *pietas* to a deceased scholar can justify in these days of costly publication the printing in more than three hundred closely-packed pages of a monograph whose positive additions to knowledge could probably be stated adequately in a tenth of the space.

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

Cornell University.

X. K. Καπνουκιάς: 'Ἡ ἀρχαία Ῥωμαία.' Pp. 139; illustrations. (Βιβλιοθήκη Ἀνωτέρας Σχολῆς Μορφώσεως Ἑλληνίδων Ἰονίου Σχολῆς, 1.) Athens, 1935. Paper.

THIS little book is a very fair example of a class that will not lack readers as long as classical studies retain their vitality. The exact choice of subject depends on the circumstances of

writing: the book forms the first volume in a library founded by the Principal of a High School for Girls in memory of her dead brother—a graceful form of memorial, indeed. Each of the four chapters, on Education, Married Life, Social Life, and Outward Appearance and Aids to Beauty, is accompanied by a list of original sources and modern commentaries, and there is a short index at the end. Studies of this kind may be drawn primarily from the ancient writers or from modern compilations, and will attain greater or less success according to the greater or less mastery achieved by the author over his material. The rare triumphs in this style only occur when ancient and modern are fused into a living whole in the mind of the writer. Mr. Kapnukagias, if he has not risen quite so high as that, has written a pleasant and successful book, based very largely on the original sources and showing a sound appreciation of the main principles of Roman character. He is well within his rights in making free use of anecdotes. The illustrations are of fair quality, but not always very appropriate—note particularly Plate I, the flogging of a Roman boy, and IV, 'Secutor and retiarius.' Few English readers will be able to bring to their task a good knowledge of modern Greek; many, like the present reviewer, will find that classical Greek, carefully applied, will supply the key.

H. MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

ERIC BIRLEY: *Corbridge Roman Station (Corstopitum), Northumberland.* (Official Guide, H.M. Office of Works.) Pp. 26; 4 plates, 1 plan. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1935. Paper, 6d.

NOT the least important feature of the work recently carried out at Corstopitum by the Durham University Excavation Committee in co-operation with H.M. Office of Works has been the appearance of this excellent Guide. Mr. Birley's judicious account of the site and its history and of the extensive remains associated with it admirably fills a long-felt want. For completeness, a map illustrating the strategic importance of the site might well have been added; and the plan should certainly include the river and bridge (inadvertently referred to on p. 19). But students and visitors to Corstopitum will nowhere obtain better value for so small an outlay.

C. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

JACK LINDSAY: *The Romans.* (The How-and-Why Series, No. 17.) Pp. 96; 6 black and white drawings. London: Black, 1935. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

MR. JACK LINDSAY has won repute for his translations from the Latin poets and his novels of Roman life and politics. He has now set himself a more difficult task—to delineate in this brief compass of a hundred pages the spirit and character of the Roman people. This little book may be called a success: it is written with knowledge, with sympathy and with pas-

sion. Mr. Lindsay's choice of quotations is happy and original—we notice excerpts from the speech of the Plutarchian Ti. Gracchus, from Petronius and from Diocletian's edict about prices. Moreover he has striven valiantly to avoid platitudes and edification. While there is much to praise, there are some alarming views. Caesar appears as the 'hero in whom the scattered impulses of the race once more drew together,' as "a new father-voice responsibly uttering command." As a result, Augustus is squeezed out—there is no recognition of the way in which he transformed usurpation into illegality and substituted administration for politics. This is a fact of enduring significance. Caesar survived only in the form of a comet, the 'Iulium sidus.'

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

FRANCIS A. EVELYN: *Agrippina. A Tragedy*. Pp. 49. London: Heath Cranton, 1935. Paper, 2s. 6d.

THE 'muliebris impotentia' of the women of the Julio-Claudian house filled their lives with drama and often ended in tragedy. We are here presented with a fluent and lucid sketch of the first few years of Nero's reign, written in prose that is never trivial or vulgar, and is sometimes distinguished. There are four brief interludes of verse—Andromache's dirge put into the mouth of the doomed and prescient Britannicus, a pair of amorous ditties by Petronius and Nero in emulation, and a Latin hymn, rendered by invisible and canorous adepts of the new faith. These are happy inventions. The theme of mother-love and ambition, thwarted both, is high tragedy: Tacitus saw this.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

H. KRUSE: *Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reiche* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XIX. Band. 3. Heft). Pp. 116. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1934. Paper, RM. 5.80.

AS the author of this essay points out, there is no exhaustive treatise on the Imperial portrait. One finds occasional references to its political importance; various privileges pertaining to it have been discussed in histories of law; its rôle in the army and government has likewise been studied; and its significance has, naturally, been most fully treated from the point of view of the Imperial cult. But we lack a comprehensive treatment of the subject, such as would require research into many questions and provide us with the opportunity of studying a most interesting cross-section of culture. For this a series of preliminary studies would be needed; and it was as a contribution to such a series that the present book was taken in hand. The author has set himself the task of examining the extent of the 'official value' of the Imperial portrait and of describing the various kinds of use to which, in consequence of this value, the portrait was put. Fundamental, he says, is the ancient notion of the identity of portrait and person por-

trayed: this explains why precisely the same honours were paid to the Imperial portrait as to the Imperial personage himself, and also why the Imperial portrait played so important a part in the Imperial cult. The 'official value' of the portrait is related to its significance in Emperor-worship. It was bound up with the constitutional position of the Emperor, and under its influence the Imperial right of portraiture took on a political character. It also led to the development of certain uses of the portrait as the Emperor's personal and legal representative and of a whole system of rules for its veneration.

Copious footnotes, containing references to ancient authors, inscriptions and papyri, bear witness to the author's learning and industry. There is a useful table of references, but no index.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

OSCAR WILLIAM REINMUTH: *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*. (Klio, Beiheft XXXIV: Neue Folge, Heft 21.) Pp. xiv+155. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 9.50 (bound, 11).

A COMPREHENSIVE study of the office of prefect has long been overdue, and the present work is warmly to be welcomed. It cannot indeed be praised unreservedly. It represents a great deal of research; the author has omitted little and states his evidence fairly; and without question the volume will be extremely useful. Yet it is hardly what might have been desired and expected from a writer so well equipped. Much of it is more properly a collection of material than a critical assessment; and the treatment is often curiously external and mechanical. The cases in which the prefect is shown by papyrus and other evidence to have been concerned are grouped together under classified heads; but there is too little attempt to relate these cases together and to elucidate the principle which underlay them. Thus chapter III, 'The Prefect and the Liturgies,' is largely beside the point, because in many of the instances cited the prefect was concerned not as the official specifically responsible for liturgies but as the head of the administration; he was of course the ultimate court of appeal on all sorts of questions. So too with chapters XI and XII, on civil and criminal jurisdiction: it is not of much use to collect the recorded cases, with the prefect's decision in each, unless an attempt is made to discover what principle determined his action in hearing cases himself or delegating them; and what was the relation between the prefect's jurisdiction and that of such an official as the juridicus.

Yet we must be grateful for the large amount of valuable information here collected and summarized; and if some chapters are open to the criticism expressed above, others, like VI, VII and particularly the 'Conclusion' (pp. 127-130), deserve high praise. There are two appendices: a list of prefects, which is commendably complete, and one of the edicts of prefects. References and summaries of documents seem usually to be accurate, but there are some misconceptions, misprints or misleading state-

ments, only two or three of which can here be mentioned.

P. 19, 'In an edict,' etc. This is a misconception. The papyrus is of A.D. 194, but the principle was not new but laid down by several prefects (ὑπὸ τῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ἡγεμόνων); and the objection was to giving a liturgy in another village to a man already holding one in his own (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 393, intr.; Oertel, *Liturgie*, p. 373).

P. 22, 'not his claim . . . but rather': better 'not only his claim . . . but also.'

Pp. 42-44, § 2. It is not made sufficiently clear that there was a distinction between the prefect's own archive and general record offices like the Nanaeum and the 'Library of Hadrian.'

On pp. 48-50 the interesting suggestion is made that the well-known edict of Ti. Julius Alexander was his 'provincial edict'; but can this be reconciled with its date? He became prefect in A.D. 66; the date of the edict was 68, which is rather a long time after his assumption of office for his provincial edict.

P. 54¹. The reference should surely be to P. Lond. 1912, not to Ditt. *OGIS*. 669.

P. 92⁶. For 'P. Lond. 3, 1032' read 'P. Oxy. 7, 1032.'

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

X. F. M. G. WOLTERS: *Notes on antique Folklore, on the basis of Pliny's Natural History Bk. XXVIII* 22-29. Pp. vii+150. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1935. Paper, fl. 2.40.

SOME day, perhaps, a commentary on the *Natural History* will be written; it will be a bulky work, but interesting throughout. Meanwhile, as we have had good interpretations of, for instance, the sections dealing with art and with chemistry, it was very proper that Dr. Wolters, who is clearly a man of acuteness and good sense as well as very considerable learning, should set about explaining one of the sections richest in folklore proper and also full of information on learned magic. Such studies are particularly appropriate in a fellow-countryman of so many excellent anthropologists and of De Jong, whose unpretentious but well-informed manual of classical magic is several times quoted.

The monograph begins with a brief account of the passage in question, its known or supposed sources, and the attitude of educated Romans towards magic in general. Then follows a text and translation, and then 125 pages of detailed commentary. In this the author has of necessity to say what he thinks on some very controversial matters; the reviewer, for example, is totally at variance with his interpretation of 27, *cibus etiam e manu . . . piatio est*, both from the point of view of Latinity and from that of *Religionsgeschichte*, and is doubtful whether, on p. 71, he is right in supposing Glykera's squeezing of her thumbs to be a mere nervous gesture. But on the whole the interpretations are very good, judicious and in keeping with recent work in folklore and ancient religion. It is a work to buy, read and keep.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

The Labyrinth; Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World. Edited by S. H. HOOKE. Pp. xiv+288; 8 plates, 36 illustrations in text. London: S.P.C.K., 1935. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

NOT all the eight essays in this ingenious work fall within the scope of a classical journal, and several are beyond the reviewer's competence to criticize in detail (Father E. Burrows on *Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion*; Dr. A. R. Johnson on *The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus*; Dr. O. S. Rankin on *The Festival of Hanukkah*—that Jewish feast better known to non-specialists as the *Eykaiva* or the *Φῶρα*,—and Professor E. O. James on *The Sources of Christian Ritual*). It should not, however, be concluded that these sections are of no interest to a classicist as such, for they are not only interesting but full of suggestive parallels to and contacts with Greek or Graeco-Roman cult. The general theme of the book is the close and organic connection between myth and ritual, which A. H. Hocart expounds with characteristic and provocative zest in the last essay, *The Life-Giving Myth*. C. N. Deedes, who opens the collection with the essay from which the title is taken, holds that the many mazes, Greek included, owe their origin to Egyptian shrines of Osiris, in which the labyrinthine building was meant for a ritual purpose, the baffling of the followers of Set in a mystery-drama. His case would be bettered by more accurate handling of the classical material. Professor Oesterley, who writes on *The Cult of Sabazios*, has a most interesting and well-digested store of information concerning its relations to the less orthodox forms of Judaism. The editor, who treats of *The Myth and Ritual Pattern in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic*, finds in that literature traces of its ultimate origin, the ceremonial struggle and triumph of a divine or quasi-divine king. The whole book is one to study critically, and will repay such examination.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

H. F. TOZER: *A History of Ancient Geography*. Second edition with additional notes by M. CARY. Pp. xxi+387+xxxiv; 10 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 16s.

THIS welcome second edition of Tozer's book, originally published in 1897, has been ably brought up to date by Dr. Cary. The method adopted is to provide additional notes (covering thirty-four pages) which partly supplement Tozer's original text, and partly modify or correct, in the light of recent researches, the opinions expressed in it. In addition to books and articles mentioned in these editorial notes there is a select *Bibliography*. The whole of the editorial work forms an admirable supplement to the original book, and this remains the best introduction to more comprehensive works on Ancient Geography.

On p. xxix of the additional notes it would have been worth while perhaps to add that the name Hippalus was given not only to the mon-

soon but also to a headland in N.E. Africa and to part of the Gulf of Aden, this being the region where the voyage to India by the monsoon began. E. H. WARMINGTON.

Birkbeck College, London.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Vol. xii. Pp. 184; 17 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1935.

THIS volume contains five articles, four of which are mainly concerned with Italian archaeology. Philip Harsh discusses in detail the vexed problem of the origins of the *Insulae* at Ostia, making full use of literary evidence and of the material from Greek and African sites, as well as of the remains in Campania and at Ostia. Agnes Kirsopp Lake reviews the literary and material evidence for the 'Tuscan Temple,' largely with a view to settling the value of the formulae given by Vitruvius. Both these articles will be indispensable to students of the wider aspects of ancient architecture. Frank E. Brown's intensive examination of the ill-published Regia is also valuable. Less important is Thomas D. Price's restoration of the house of Marcus Loreius Tiburtinus at Pompeii, which is accompanied by a brief text by A. W. Van Buren. Dorothy M. Schullian's elaborate critical publication of Heirec's excerpts from Valerius Maximus chiefly concerns medievalists.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

A Bibliography on the Survival of the Classics.

First volume. The publication of 1931. The text of the German edition with an English introduction. Edited by the Warburg Institute. Pp. xxii + 333. London: Cassell, 1934. Paper, 21s.

THE editors of this book, whose combination of English title and German contents is explained by the removal of the Warburg Institute from Hamburg to London, are more explicit in their own tongue (*Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike*). They have collected under appropriate headings, as *Folklore, Religion and Mythology, Philosophy, Law, Pictorial Traditions, Late Antiquity, Byzantium*, etc., all manner of books and articles published in the year which bear in any way upon the survival of classical ideas in the mediaeval and modern periods. How wide their net has been cast is apparent if we glance at a few random titles. These include A. D. Fraser on *A Scottish Version of the Odyssey-Polyphemus Myth* (reviewed on p. 18); Joan Evans' *Pattern* (p. 77); K. Lehmann-Hartleben on the form of Greek shrines (p. 151); F. Pelster on the MSS. of Duns Scotus; H. Robinson's *Bayle the Sceptic*, and other works to the total number of 1,238, all of which are given short but competent reviews. If this worthy enterprise can continue as it has begun, a most valuable addition to bibliography will result.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the 'Classical Review'

DEAR SIRS,

In the course of a kind review in your November issue (page 204), the hope is expressed that I may find means to publish my collation of O, the Vatican Plato. To avoid misunderstanding I venture to point out that in the appendices of my book and on the pages indexed under *collations* in the Editorial Index I have given some 400 readings of O, not to mention other manuscripts, in the form of corrections and supplements to Burnet's apparatus; I did not give more because there were no more of significance that had not been correctly cited before. I suppose that any new edition of the *Laws* will include a more minute collation, but, except where I may have made a mistake, it can add very little to our knowledge of the text. I have no intention of editing the *Laws* myself, but I should be glad to have my material used by anyone who undertakes the task.

Your reviewer, in remarking that I did not tackle the problem of the relation of A and the first part of O, overlooks my statements on pages 6 and 12. The common ancestor of AO was in uncials and had ca. 18 letters to the line. A more remote ancestor, which was probably the archetype of all our Plato manuscripts, had ca. 27 letters to the line. References to these pages are found in the Paleographical

Index under *ancestor of AO and archetype*. Perhaps I expected too much of my rather elaborate index.

Very truly yours,
L. A. POST.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
HAVERFORD, PA.,
December 4, 1935.

To the Editors of the 'Classical Review.'

SIRS,

I am most grateful to your reviewer for his praise of my translation of Ovid's *Art of Love* [C.R. XLIX. 192], but his criticism of my introduction seems to me to show a misconception of my purpose. My object was not to produce a textbook, but to introduce to English readers, who may or may not have any knowledge of Latin, one of the most famous works of antiquity in the form, the spirit and, as nearly as may be, the actual words of the original. Such readers are not interested in 'the structure of Roman society' or 'the social legislation of Augustus.' But they would rejoice in the parallels between Ovid's day and our own, and the modern analogies and phraseology to which your reviewer takes exception were deliberately introduced to arrest their attention and enlist their interest.

As regards his detailed criticisms, no one can

be more conscious than myself of the imperfections of my work, but many of his censures seem to me to be matters of opinion. For instance, I do not agree—nor does the Loeb translator—that 'libo' in l. 429 is ablative of means. I do not agree that 'pages' and 'tirade' in l. 464 are inappropriate, or that l. 498 refers to dress, or that 'wields' in l. 48 is faulty English; and so on.

Also I feel entitled to protest at his criticism of my version of 2. 735-738. Here Ovid compares himself in turn to Podalirius, Achilles, Nestor, Calchas, Ajax and Automedon. To get all these names with their characteristics into three and a half lines of English heroics is a severe tax on the ingenuity of the translator. Because forsooth in doing so I have ventured to transpose some of them, the passage is cen-

sured as 'a violent departure from the Latin order.' Could pedantry go further?

Yours faithfully,
B. P. MOORE.

IN reply to a criticism of his *Remains of Old Latin* (C.R. XLIX. 188) Professor E. H. Warmington has written to say that he intended 'clarabunt' to be the first word of a hexameter, not the last. It is to be regretted that this intention was not made clear either by a vertical stroke before the word or by a C.—EDD. C.R.

Dr. Witlox has written to say that the publisher of his *Consolatio ad Liviam* (see C.R. XLIX. 155) is Van Aelst of Maastricht (not of Utrecht).

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to C.R. denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

GNOMON.

XI. 11. NOVEMBER, 1935.

E. Burck: *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1934. Pp. viii+244] (Klingner). The first part forms a useful supplement to commentaries on the first five books of Livy; the second is a more questionable attempt to connect Livy with Hellenistic historians. H. Hafiter: *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (C.R. XLIX. 26] (Drexler). D. is doubtful about the first part, but admires the book as a whole, though it is difficult to read. J. Braune: *Nonnos und Ovid* [Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1935. Pp. 41] (Keydell). A fruitful book, showing the influence of Latin literature on late Greek poetry. H. Panitz: *Mythos und Orakel bei Herodot* [C.R. XLIX. 203] (Hellmann). Dependent on out-of-date work and mostly unsatisfactory. A. Körte: *Der Begriff des Klassischen in der Antike* [Leipzig: Hirzel, 1934. Pp. 14] (Gadamer). G. criticizes. E. Kornemann: *Staaten, Völker, Männer* [C.R. XLVIII. 215] (Strasburger). Miscellaneous studies which illustrate the scholarly mind and wide interests of the author. M. Hammond: *The Augustan Principate* . . . [C.R. XLVIII. 144] (Hohl). A welcome survey. F. Ciaceri: *Tiberio, Successore di Augusto* [Milan: 'Dante Alighieri', 1934. Pp. xi+335] (Ensslin). Rather uncritical. C. is not well acquainted with the relevant literature. E. Fremersdorf: *Der römische Gutshof Köln-Müngersdorf* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933. Pp. iv+138, 59 plates, 11 illustrations, 4²] (Rostovtzeff). Interesting and valuable. V. Kuzinszky: *Aquincum* [Budapest, 1934. Pp. 234, 2 maps] (Goessler). An instructive guide for specialists and laymen alike. A. Yon: *Ratio et les mots de la famille de reor* [C.R. XLVIII. 200] (Kroll). A solid subject treated in a scholarly and attractive way. *Etudes de Papyrologie* II. 2 [Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1934.

Pp. 73-249] (Schubart). Well edited. Sch. gives a table of contents.—Bibliographical Supplement 1935 Nr. 5 (down to October 31).

XI. 12. DECEMBER, 1935.

Inscriptiones Graecae consilio et auctoritate Academiae Borussicae editae. Vol. II et III ed. min. III 1: *Dedications, tituli honorarii, tituli sacri* ed. J. Kirchner [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935. Pp. 362 4²] (Körte). K. discusses some points in detail. He welcomes the last fascicule but one of this important work. T. C. Skeat: *The Dorians in Archaeology* (London: de la More Press, 1934. Pp. 68, 2 plates] (Kraiker). K. summarizes the contents, which he does not find very satisfactory. K. Bittel: *Prähistorische Forschung in Kleinasien* (Stamboul: Archäolog. Inst. des Deutschen Reiches, 1934. Pp. 145, 21 plates] (Lamb). An admirable collection and survey of the evidence. R. Demangel: *La frise ionique* [Paris: de Boccard, 1932. Pp. 609, 13 plates] (Möbius). Not persuasive. E. Dyggve, F. Poulsen, and K. Rhomaio: *Das Heroon von Kalydon* (Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard, 1934. Pp. 145, 7 plates 4²) (Zschieutschmann). Able and interesting, though some questions remain unanswered. D. Burr: *Terra-cottas from Myrina in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* [Diss. Bryn Mawr, 1931. Vienna: Holzhausen, 1934. Pp. v+86, 42 plates] (Lippold). A useful dissertation of wider importance than the title suggests. L. Laurand: *Cicéron* [C.R. XLIX. 190] (Kroll). There are good things in both volumes, but the merits are uneven. A. Braun: *Stratificazione dei linguaggi indoeuropei nell'Italia antica* [Venice: Ferrari, 1934. Pp. 68] (Specht). Neither the theory nor the exposition is satisfactory. *Thesaurus linguae latinae epigraphicae* II 1: *Asturica-audio* (C.R. XLIX. 210) (Lommatzsch). Potentially very useful, but later volumes should be shortened. E. Leider: *Der Handel von Alex-*

andrea [C.R. XLIX, 154] (Passerini). Unprofitable. *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura* [C.R. XLIX, 206] (Souter). A learned and sober treatment of an important discovery. P. Damerou: *Kaiser Claudius II Gothicus* [C.R. XLIX, 148] (Strasbourg). Painstaking, but makes no advance on Burckhardt. *Medieval Latin Word-List* from British and Irish sources prepared by J. H. Baxter and C. Johnson [Oxford: Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xiii + 466] (Mørland). Useful in itself though incomplete. Promises well for the future dictionary.—Obituary notice of Girolamo Vitelli by R. Pfeiffer.—Bibliographical supplement 1935 Nr. 6 (down to November 30).—Index to vol. XI.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(MAY—SEPTEMBER, 1935.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—K. Reinhardt, *Sophokles* [Frankfurt a. M., 1933, Klostermann. Pp. 288] (A. Lesky). Fruitful inquiry into chronological development of dramatic form in Sophocles. Long review and criticism of details.—F. Dornseiff, *Nochmals der homerische Apollonhymnos* [C.R. XLIX, 90] (C. Fries). Reviewer is convinced by D.'s arguments, but reproves him for pettiness towards scholars who hold different opinions.—K. Riezler, *Parmenides* [Frankfurt a. M., 1934, Klostermann. Pp. 99] (Wilhelm Nestle). Ingenious, but hardly possible, interpretation.—Walter Nestle, *Menschliche Existenz und politische Erziehung in der Tragödie des Aischylos* [Stuttgart, 1934, Kohlhammer. Pp. vii + 99] (W. Morel). Penetrating analyses.—G. Perrotta, *Saffo e Pindaro* [C.R. XLIX, 61] (E. Kalinka). Instructive portraits of the poetical personalities of Sappho and Pindar.—J. Hundt, *Der Traumglaube bei Homer* [Greifswald, 1935. Pp. 112] (S. Lorenz). Handy discussion of individual dreams; generally convincing.—H. J. Rose, *A handbook of Greek literature from Homer to the age of Lucian* [C.R. XLVIII, 217] (J. Schönmeyer). Happy achievement. Popular in tone, but combined with thoroughness and sound independent judgment.—P. Shorey, *What Plato said* [C.R. XLVII, 181] (C. Ritter). Written with exceptionally wide knowledge of Plato and will be of permanent value. But in a long discussion reviewer finds much to criticize.

LATIN LITERATURE.—F. Villeneuve, *Horace, Épitres* [C.R. XLIX, 155] (R. Helm). Excellent achievement.—D. J. H. Waszink, *Tertulian, De anima* [C.R. XLVII, 248] (A. Kraemer). Written with extraordinary industry and great learning. But German text extremely faulty and in need of revision.—N. Terzaghi, *C. Lucilii Saturnarum reliquiae* [C.R. XLVIII, 225] (R. Helm). Honest and ingenious attempt to fit the fragments together into a consecutive whole. But reviewer remains very sceptical. Long critical review.—J. Martin, *Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Apologeticus* [C.R. XLVII, 248] (A. Kraemer). Comprehensive introduction, good text with critical apparatus, very helpful commentary. Excellent edition.—

R. Helm, *Die Praetexta 'Octavia'*. Sitz.-Ber. d. Preuss. Ak. d. Wiss., 1934, Phil.-hist. Kl. XVI, XVII [Berlin, 1934] (J. Köhm). Reviewer discusses H.'s work at length and rejects his arguments against the genuineness of the play.—P. Ovidi Nusb, *Les Métamorphoses*. Text rev. i trad. de Adela Ma. Trepai i Anna Ma. de Saavedra [Barcelona, 1931-32] (Magdalena Schmidt). Reviewer discusses text in some detail and criticizes partly favourably, partly unfavourably.—A. Ernout, *Plaute, Tome III* [C.R. XLIX, 188] (A. Klotz). Text generally acceptable, reliable critical apparatus, helpful translation. Reviewer discusses some metrical points.—C. Marchesi, *Arnobii adversus nationes libri VII* [C.R. XLIX, 209] (W. Kroll). M. has fulfilled his task excellently and provided a good foundation for further study of Arnobius.

HISTORY.—E. Ciaceri, *Tiberio successore di Augusto* [Milan, 1934, Soc. ed. Dante Alighieri. Pp. xi + 335] (E. Hohl). Detailed account of life and reign of Tiberius. Conscientious and enthusiastic monograph.—R. Cohen, *Cléo. Introduction aux études historiques. La Grèce et l'Hellénisation du monde antique* [Paris, 1934, Presses Universitaires. Pp. xlv + 667] (T. Lenschau). Chief merit of this excellent introduction are the notes to each chapter, which give a survey of sources, references to modern literature, and invaluable summaries of main problems.—Giuseppina Lombardi, *Cimone* [C.R. XLVIII, 237] (T. Lenschau). Does not advance far beyond Swoboda's article in Pauly-Wissowa, but is valuable for observations on general political situation.—G. N. Cross, *Epirus* [C.R. XLVI, 261] (W. Ensslin). Critical acumen and sound judgment combined with flowing style. Deserves full praise.—Renata von Scheliha, *Dion. Die Platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien* [Leipzig, 1934, Dieterich. Pp. 166] (J. Pavlu). Reviewer praises S.'s industry and attractive account, but thinks she sees Dion in too favourable a light.—J. Carcopino, *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain* [C.R. XLVIII, 195] (E. Hohl). Combines six previously published essays and speeches. Clever and very instructive.

PHILOSOPHY.—Wilhelm Nestle, *Griechische Religiosität vom Zeitalter des Perikles bis auf Aristoteles und Griechische Religiosität von Alexander d. G. bis auf Proklos* [C.R. XLVIII, 174 and XLIX, 70] (R. Wagner). Living, never tiring account by an expert guide. Enormous material skilfully grouped and handled.—O. Rieth, *Grundbegriffe der stoischen Ethik* [C.R. XLVIII, 240] (Wilhelm Nestle). Substantial advance in our knowledge and understanding of Stoic philosophy.—W. Stettner, *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern* [C.R. XLIX, 37] (Wilhelm Nestle). S.'s work, intended to support Wilamowitz' hypothesis, has turned out to be a proof of its unsoundness.—O. Gigon, *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit* [C.R. XLIX, 133] (Wilhelm Nestle). Often throws light on individual fragments; but his attempt to reconstruct Heraclitus' system without the doctrine of flux has proved impossible. Very substantial work.

RELIGION.—A. Eрман, *Die Religion der Ägypter, ihr Werden und Vergehen in vier Jahrtausenden* [Berlin, 1934, de Gruyter. With

10 plates and 186 figures] (F. W. Frhr. von Bissing). This third edition has grown from 12 to 22 chapters and is therefore a new book. Long review.

LAW.—S. G. Huwardas, *Beiträge zum griechischen und gräko-ägyptischen Eherecht der Ptolemäer- und frühen Kaiserzeit* [Leipzig, 1931, Weicher. Pp. vi+59] and *Beiträge zur Lehre von den actiones arbitrarie, insbesondere von der actio de eo quod certo loco dari oportet im klassischen römischen Recht* [Leipzig, Weicher. Pp. ii+64] (B. Kübler). Contributes much towards a solution of two difficult problems. Long review.—M. Wlassak, *Confessio in iure und Defensionsweigerung nach der Lex Rubria de Gallia Cisalpina*. Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abteilung, 1934. Heft 8 [Munich, 1934, Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss. Pp. 93] (B. Kübler). Proves his points with the inimitable thoroughness and polished expression peculiar to him.

LANGUAGE.—F. Sommer, *Akhijavāfrage und Sprachwissenschaft*. Abh. d. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abteilung, N.F. Heft 9 [Munich, 1934, Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss. Pp. 101 fol.] (P. Kretschmer). An attack on Kretschmer's 'Hypachäer.' K. defends himself vigorously, rejects S.'s views, and brings up further linguistic and archaeological evidence in support.—R. S. Conway, J. Whatmough, and S. E. Johnson, *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* [C.R. XLVIII, 183] (E. Hermann). Careful and reliable collection and edition of inscriptions and proper nouns.—A. Prévot, *L'aoriste grec en -θη* [Paris, 1935, Champion. Pp. 223] (A. Debrunner). Etymologically improbable. Sounder as a collection of material, but method nowhere explained nor distinction made between new and already accepted views.—J. D. Denniston, *The Greek particles* [C.R. XLVIII, 221] (E. Hermann). Substantial advance. D. shows real feeling for Greek modes of expression. But inscriptions ought not to have been neglected, and more use should have been made of etymology.—R. Nehrbass, *Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidauros* [C.R. XLIX, 205] (A. Debrunner). Section on style, for which N. shows fine feeling, is far the best; his linguistic knowledge is very faulty.—G. Rohlf, *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*, dal manoscritto tedesco tradotto da B. Tomasini [Halle, 1933, Niemeyer. Pp. xv+303, and one map] (E. Hermann). A thoroughly re-fashioned and augmented edition in Italian of R.'s book 'Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien' (1924). More convincing than ever.

PALAEOGRAPHY.—E. K. Rand, *Studies in the script of Tours. II.* [C.R. XLIX, 149] (P. Lehmann). Very great service to palaeography. Will always have to be consulted in spite of future additions and corrections.—E. A. Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores. Part I.* [C.R. XLVIII, 189] (P. Lehmann). Very highly appreciated, and warm hopes expressed for successful continuation.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—Berytus. *Archaeological studies published by the Museum of Archaeology of the American University of Beirut* [Beirut, 1934, American Press. Pp. viii+47, with 12 plates] (P. Thomsen). Contains wealth

of finds excellently illustrated by descriptions and pictures.—G. Brusin, *Gli scavi di Aquileia, 1929-1932* [Udine, 1934, Le Panarie. Pp. vii+253, with 147 figures, many illustrations, and 6 plans] (W. Kubitschek). Contains copious material. Most valuable.—E. Kunze, *Orchomenos III. Die Keramik der frühen Bronzezeit*. Abh. d. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abteilung, N.F. Heft 8 [Munich, 1934, Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss.] (R. Herbig). Self-sacrificing work brilliantly completed and published. Worthy successor to 'Orchomenos II.' 34 excellent plates.—F. de Ruyt, *Charun, Démon étrusque de la mort* [Brussels, 1934, Lamartin. Pp. xii+305] (F. Pfister). Excellent monograph (with 58 illustrations) containing complete descriptive catalogue of representations of Charun.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Bessie E. Richardson, *Old age among the ancient Greeks* [C.R. XLVIII, 87] (W. Ensslin). Exhaustive collection and appreciation of widely scattered material. H. J. M. Milne, *Greek Shorthand Manuals, syllabary and commentary* [London, 1934. Pp. 78, with 9 plates] (A. Mentz). Excellent work which deserves our complete confidence and warm thanks. Will long remain the foundation for further research. Reviewer criticizes two points in detail.—K. Huber, *Theorie der gymnischen Erziehung bei den Römern* [Langensalza, 1934, Beyer and Sons. Pp. vi+109] (J. Schönmamm). Carefully considered and thorough work from which much can be learnt.—P. Friedländer, *Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht* [C. R. XLIX, 62] (E. Kalinka and W. Fischer). Reviewers contribute two discussions of the genuineness of the music. No decisive conclusions.—F. Kuypers, *Griechenland* [Munich, 1935, Bruckmann. Pp. xx+199, with 96 plates] (E. Ziebarth). Description of journey through Greece, but deals with ancient as well as modern times. Valuable guide.—W. Sieglin, *Die blonden Haare der indogermanischen Völker des Altertums* [Munich, 1935, Lehmann. Pp. 151] (H. Philipp). Contains invaluable material. Most stimulating and instructive, and a pleasure to read.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXIX, NOS. 4-8. NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1935.

Ethel H. Brewster, *In Roman Egypt. Life (from the papyri) of Tryphon, weaver of Oxyrhynchus, in the first century.* H. C. Nutting, *Tac. Hist. I. 21. 5. Understand as et non-cunctatione opus.* I. 33. 3, *toleraturus* is 'able to stand' a siege, cp. meaning of *factura* in Lucan V. 366. I. 44. 1, *maiestatis* in Galba is probably 'treason'. *Cic. Tusc. Disp. II. 37-38.* If the words *tantum interest inter novum et veterem exercitum* refer to Pharsalus, they are hardly true or ingenious. II. 39, *non potest ecfari* (passive) should be kept in the lines from Ennius, apparently remembered by Ter. *Hec. 415-7*, non . . . dici potest. *Caes. B.C. III. 38. 1* and *II. 36. 2: velle* seems pleonastic. *III. 41. 3, Dyrrhachium . . . ut accidit* is awk-

ward writing (like III. 77. 1) but need not be rewritten as by Meusel. *B.G. V.* 25. 2, 'had found his services of unusual value.' H. J. Leon, *The Technique of Emotional Appeal in Cicero's Judicial Speeches*. Conscious technique following the rules given in his own rhetorical treatises. J. P. Pritchard, *Hawthorne's Debt to Classical Literary Criticism*. H. W. Kamp, *Seneca's Appearance*. He was not always emaciated, and the full-faced Berlin bust is preferable to the Herculean type. J. L. Heller, *Ancient Rhetoric in the Modern College Course in Speech*. T. B. Jones, *George Grote and his History of Greece*. Life and influences on his work. R. M. Geer, *On the Use of Ice and Snow for Cooling Drinks*. Roman, but also Greek, Prodicus ap. Xen. *Mem.* II. 1. 30, and cp. the Athenian black-figured *ψυκτῆρες* of

the sixth century B.C. Gertrude Hirst, Juvenal, III 201-2. The pigeons, noisy and dirty, are mentioned only as an added misery of the client. E. S. McCartney, *Wolves and Music*. Hor. *Odes* I. 22. 9-12 is a mere conceit. L. R. Lind notes an echo of Herodotus (VII. 108) in A. E. Housman's poetry. *Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals IV-VI*.

REVIEWS.—E. Brehaut, *Cato the Censor on Farming, Translated with Intro. and Commentary*, New York, 1933. Detailed reviews by H. B. Ash and E. S. McCartney. A. Kleingünther, *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΤΡΕΤΗΣ*, Philologus, Supplementband XXVI, Heft I, Leipzig, 1933. On the ascription of the arts to inventors, culminating in a fourth century B.C. literary type 'On Inventions.' Favourable (Marian Harman).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Antweiler* (A.) *Der Begriff der Wissenschaft bei Aristoteles*. Pp. 120. Bonn: Hanstein, 1936. Paper, M. 3.80.
- Barber* (G. L.) *The Historian Ephorus*. Pp. xii + 190. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Basore* (J. H.) *Seneca. Moral Essays*. With an English translation. In 3 volumes. III. Pp. x + 532. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Biscardi* (A.) *Il dogma della collisione alla luce del diritto romano*. Pp. 192. Città di Castello: S. A. "Leonardo da Vinci," 1935. Paper, L. 30.
- Botschuyver* (H. J.) *Scholia in Horatium λφψ codicum Parisinorum Latinorum 7972, 7974, 7971*. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit H. J. B. Pp. xi + 493. Amsterdam: van Bottenburg, 1935. Cloth, f. 10.50 (unbound, 9.75).
- Boszi* (L.) *Ideali e Correnti letterarie nell'Eneide*. Pp. 181. (R. Università di Milano, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia.) Milan: Principato, 1936. Paper, L. 10.
- Cary* (M.) *A History of Rome down to the Reign of Constantine*. Pp. xvi + 820; illustrations and maps. London: Macmillan, 1935. Cloth, 10s.
- Chaplin* (M. A.) *Latin Unseens with Accompanying Exercises*. Pp. 100. London: University Tutorial Press, 1935. Cloth, 1s. 3d.
- Coster* (C. H.) *The Iudicium Quinquievirale*. Pp. 87. (Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America, No. 10.) Cambridge (Mass.): Mediaeval Academy of America, 1935. Cloth, \$2.25.
- Disceptatio amantium et Roma caput mundi. Carmina certaminis poetici Hoeufftiani*. Pp. 14 + 19. Amsterdam: Academia Regia Disciplinarum Nederlandica, 1935. Paper.
- Fitshugh* (T.) *ἱαμβος: Aryan Sacred Voice of Stress. Origin and Genesis of Speech*. Pp. 70. (University of Virginia, Bulletin of the School of Latin, 2nd Series, No. 6.) Charlottesville (Va.): Anderson Brothers, 1935. Paper, \$3.
- Giusti* (A.) *Antologia omerica. Odissea*. Pp. 207. Milan: Signorelli, 1935. Paper, L. 5.
- Giusti* (A.) *Tra Leggenda e Storia*. Pp. 12. Genoa: Libreria Italiana, 1935. Paper.
- Glots* (G.) *Histoire générale. Histoire ancienne, 3^{me} Partie. Histoire romaine, Tome II: La République romaine de 133 à 44 avant J.-C. II: César, par J. Carcopino*. Pp. 489-1059. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1936. Paper, 60 fr.
- Goldschmidt* (E. Ph.) *Burchardus de Belleaux: Apologia de Barbis. A Twelfth Century Treatise on Beards and their Moral and Mystical Significance*. Now for the first time Edited. . . . Pp. x + 97. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 17s. 6d.
- Harder* (R.) *Plotins Schriften, übersetzt von R. H. Band II: Die Schriften 22-29 der chronologischen Reihenfolge*. Pp. 207. Leipzig: Meiner, 1936. Paper, RM. 9.50 (bound, 11).
- Hartog* (Sir P.) and *Rhodes* (E. C.) *An Examination of Examinations. (International Institute Examinations Enquiry)*. Pp. 81. London: Macmillan, 1935. Paper, 1s.
- Heidel* (W. A.) *Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II*. Pp. 53-135. (Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. XVIII, Part 2.) Boston: Published by the Academy, 1935. Paper.
- Hennemann* (A.) *Der äussere und innere Stil in Trajans Briefen*. Pp. viii + 58. Giessen (printed by R. Noske of Borna-Leipzig), 1935. Paper.
- Hesperia*. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IV; No. 4.

- Pp. 525-590; 7 plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1935. Paper.
- Hyde* (W. W.) Roman Alpine Routes. Pp. xvi + 248; map. (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. II.) Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1935. Paper.
- Jaeger* (W.) Paideia. Die Formung des griechischen Menschen. 1. Band. 2. Auflage. Pp. 513. Leipzig and Berlin: de Gruyter, 1936. Cloth, RM. 8.
- Joseph* (H. W. B.) Essays in Ancient and Modern Philosophy. Pp. 340. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 15s.
- Liedmeier* (C.) Plutarchus' Biographie van Aemilius Paullus. Historische Commentaar. Pp. 312 + (Greek text) 28. Utrecht and Nijmegen: Dekker en Van de Vegt, 1935. Paper.
- Lind* (L. R.) What Rome has left us. Pp. 34. Williamsport, Pennsylvania: Bayard Press, 1935. Paper, 50 cents.
- Lowe* (E. A.) Codices Latini Antiquiores. A palaeographical guide to Latin manuscripts prior to the ninth century. Part II. Great Britain and Ireland. Pp. xvii + 53; plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth and boards, 60s.
- Marousseau* (J.) L'année philologique. Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine. Publiée sous la direction de J. M. par J. Ernst. Tome IX. Bibliographie de l'année 1934 et complément des années antérieures. Pp. xxiii + 438. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 65 fr.
- Meyerstein* (E. H. W.) The Elegies of Propertius done into English Verse. Pp. xvi + 194. London: Milford, 1935. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera*. First Series. Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200. Edited by K. and S. Lake. IV. Manuscripts in Paris. Part I. Pp. 17; plates 227-300. Boston, U.S.A.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences (London: Christophers), 1935. Portfolio, 44s.
- Nap* (J. M.) Die römische Republik um das J. 225 v. Chr. Ihre damalige Politik, Gesetze und Legenden. Pp. xvi + 457. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1935. Paper, fl. 4.50 (bound, 5.50).
- Nicholson* (J.) A Handy First Year Latin Book. Pp. ix + 132. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1935. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Nicklin* (T.) The Suppliant Women of Euripides. The Oxford text . . . with introduction and explanatory notes. Pp. xii + 120. London: Milford, 1936. Cloth, 3s.
- Oldfather* (C. H.) Diodorus of Sicily. With an English translation. In ten volumes. II. Books II, 35-IV, 58. Pp. x + 539; 2 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Rackham* (H.) This Way and That. Being translations into and out of Greek and Latin verse and prose. Pp. 120. Cambridge: Heffer, 1935. Cloth, 6s.
- Ramsay* (A. B.) Frondes Salicis. More versions, Latin and English. Pp. 124. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 5s.
- Rattenbury* (R. M.), *Lumb* (T. W.), *Maillo* (J.) Héliodore, Les Ethiopiennes (Théagène et Chariclée). Tome I. Texte établi par R. M. R. et T. W. L. et traduit par J. M. Pp. ci + 250. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 25 fr.
- Rolfe* (J. C.) Ammianus Marcellinus. With an English translation. In 3 volumes. I. Pp. 1 + 583; portrait, 2 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Sage* (E. T.) Livy. With an English translation. In 13 volumes. X. Books XXXV-XXXVII. Pp. xi + 491; 3 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Smerlenko* (C. M.) and *Belknap* (G. N.) Studies in Greek Religion. Pp. 61. (University of Oregon Publication, Vol V, No. 1.) Eugene: University of Oregon, 1935. Paper, 50 cents.
- Sörbom* (G.) Variatio sermonis Tacitei aliaque apud eundem quaestiones selectae. Pp. xv + 190. Upsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1935. Paper.
- Strzelecki* (L.) De Naeviano Belli Punici Carmine. Pp. 40. Cracow etc.: Gebethner i Wolff, 1935. Paper.
- Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*. Volume II. The Lloyd Collection, Parts V-VI. Galaria to Selinus. 12 plates and letterpress. London: Milford, 1935. Paper, 12s.
- Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. XIV. Ediderunt S. Eitrem et E. Skard. Pp. 137. Oslo: Brøgger, 1935. Paper.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies* 1935. Edited by S. G. Owen. Pp. xi + 103. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1935. Paper, 3s. 6d.
- Tucker* (T. G.) The Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus translated. Pp. 49. Melbourne: University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Untersteiner* (M.) Sofocle: Studio critico. Vol. I: pp. 640; Vol. II: pp. 175. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1935. Paper, (together) L. 30.
- Vince* (J. H.) Demosthenes against Meidias, Androtion, Aristocrates, Timocrates, Aristogeiton. With an English translation. Pp. vii + 597. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- von Haxthausen* (W.) Neugriechische Volkslieder gesammelt von W. v. H. Urtext und Uebersetzung herausgegeben von K. S. Kemminghausen und G. Soyter. Pp. ix + 195; map. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1935. Stiff paper, R.M. 5.62; bound, 6.60 (export prices).
- Weiland* (H. C.) Het Oordeel der Kerkvaders over het Orakel. Pp. 95. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1935. Paper.
- Wikström* (T.) In Firmicum Maternum studia critica. Pp. xiii + 128. Upsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1935. Paper.
- Yale Classical Studies*, edited by A. M. Harmon. Vol. V. Pp. 304; illustrations. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

on
ae
ar
l.
le
5.
h
l.
i-
5.
-
-
b
n,
es
of
e:
s.
e-
p.
l,
r-
i
I.
ia
n-
S.
:
5.
s-
of
:
5.
o.
r-
o-
s,
o-
p.
n-
er,
s-
nd
n-
5;
5.
ort
ers
n :
ia
ist
ar-
ew
n :